DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 906 EC 062 130

TITLE	CEC Professional Standards and Guidelines Project. Draft Standards and Guidelines (St. Louis Work Document).
INSTITUTION	Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Va. Professional Standards/Guidelines Project.
PUB DATE	Jun 74
NOTE	158p.; Prepared for the National Professional Standards and Guidelines Project Conference (St. Louis, Missouri, June 1974)
AVAILABLE FROM	Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$7.80 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Exceptional Child Education; Glossaries; Guidelines; Handicapped Children; *Special Education Teachers; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Qualifications; *Teacher Selection

ABSTRACT

The working draft presents guidelines for recruitment/selection, preparation, certification, and professional performance of special educators. The guidelines are said to emphasize process rather than content of decision making in an effort to encourage innovation, provide for flexibility, and develop continuing programs of professional development. Assumptions of the guidelines are said to include extension of the right to education to all children. It is explained that the guidelines were developed from results of regional conferences and a DELPHI survey. Presented for each guideline are the guideline statement, alternative statements, rationale for the guideline, and positive and negative examples of guideline applications. Guidelines in the area of recruitment/selection are concerned with selection from a broad base, effectiveness with children, mobility of individuals into new positions, criteria, the selection process, evaluation, exceptional citizens, and experience. Guidelines concerned with preparation are divided into the following categories: needs assessment, resource analysis, curriculum and methods, practicums, evaluation, and personnel. Guidelines for certification are presented in terms of criteria, renewal, range, evaluation, reciprocity, and experimentation. Suggested guidelines for professional performance deal with individual accountability, participation in evaluation, institutional support of inservice education, the right to perform within ethical standards, and grievance procedures. A glossary of 46 terms such as needs assessment and practicum is also provided. (DB)

ED 091906

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ST. LOUIS
WORK DOCUMENT

CEC

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS & GUIDELINES PROJECT

Draft
Standards & Guidelines

This set of draft guideline statements was compiled from a variety of sources. An earlier version was used to stimulate discussions by participants at five Regional Conferences held December 1973 - March 1974 (Phoenix, Portland, Ore., Boston, Milwaukee, Atlanta). The group and individual reactions at the regional conferences were reviewed by the Project Advisory Committee and project staff in preparing this version for further discussion and recommendations at the National Professional Standards and Guidelines Project Conference in St. Louis in June 1974.

June 1974

EC 090203

CONTENTS

Chapter I Introduction.....

Background.....1-4

Draft Guidelines Format 5-6

Chapter II Draft Guidelines .....

Section 1 Recruitment and Selection....7-40

2 Preparation.....41-131

3 Certification.....132-147

4 Professional Practices.....148-153

Appendix 154-156

Chapter I

Introduction

The Professional Standards/Guidelines Project of CEC has as its goal the updating or reframing of the earlier guidelines statements as well as the very critical task of establishing processes for their periodic updating, review, and evaluation. This project includes an educational program and a vigorous effort to elicit input from all sectors of the practitioner and consumer community in special education.

The scope of the project extends from paraprofessionals to postdoctoral levels of preparation and performance.

The project will produce broadly stated guidelines that, it is hoped, will be useful in various kinds of implementation, that is, in self-study, planning of preparation programs, state approval activities, certification, accreditation and so forth. But the project is not, in and of itself, designed to produce specific instruments and procedures for such developmental and standards-oriented activities. What is intended is that the project yield helpful general guidelines for viewing professional activities in the field of special education but that the project will not encompass anything like official regulating or evaluative functions.

Quite commonly, statements of professional standards and guidelines for personnel include detailed statements of competencies, content, or subject matter to be mastered by those who wish to be credentialed or "qualified" in a field. The CEC Statement of 1966 took that form in large part; however, this current activity is taking a different course.

A process rather than a content orientation is being followed. Instead of specifying in detail a particular body of content or a set of competencies proposed for paraprofessionals, teachers, teacher educators,

and others, the orientation is to processes by which preparation centers and other agencies might make decisions on selection, curriculum, methods of instruction, competencies, and other elements. The rationale for this approach is the following:

1. Statements of detailed standards have tended to create standardized programs and to frustrate innovative efforts. This kind of effect would be particularly unfortunate at this time when the field of special education quite clearly needs to stimulate innovation to improve its recruitment and selection, preparation programs, and criteria for licensure in its efforts to create new and improved models for service to exceptional children.
2. National statements of content standards for personnel training or licensure frequently make assumptions about some limited set of categories of personnel. To further rigidify a set of categories for the field of special education at this time would be particularly unfortunate in view of the healthy explorations now underway in many places to redefine and remove boundary lines between regular and special education and among the traditional categories of special education personnel.
3. National statements of standards in content terms also tend to become minimum thresholds; all who exceed the minimum standard rightly claim credibility. Such an approach calls for regulation by some agency but it neglects the developmental problems which exist everywhere in the field. It is in this framework that the present statements are oriented to <u>guidelines</u> even more than to professional standards in any minimal threshold sense. This approach calls for a <u>process</u> orientation.

4. It is desirable that statements of standards and guidelines be usable in a kind of diagnostic and planning framework. By the process route it is proposed that particular institutions, including CEC, will have a concrete basis for a strong continuing program of professional diagnosis and development.

For these several reasons the draft statements are designed to be process rather than content in orientation.

The background and assumptions for the current approach were derived heavily from the basic policy statements "Basic Committment and Responsibilities to Exceptional Children" and from the DELPHI survey conducted as part of the project. A partial enumeration of some of the background assumptions includes the following:

1. That the field of special education is entering a period of extremely rapid and difficult qualitative and quantitative changes.
2. That education as a right will be extended to all children, which will require the rapid development of programs for severely handicapped children and of inclusive school placement procedures.
3. That systems of utilizing specialized personnel in schools are moving raplidly toward toward the integration of profession personnel, in general, and, in particular, more special educators can be expected to serve in support roles and fewer in self-contained specialized teaching situations.

4. The educational roles will be structured with greater variety in the future and differentiated staffing will permit diverse combinations of individual competencies to create programmatic strengths and balances.
5. That the isolation of educational agencies will be less acceptable in the future and colleges, school systems, state and local agencies, hospitals and other agencies serving exceptional children will form new interactive networks to provide training for specialized personnel and services to exceptional children.
6. That the needs of children are primary in schooling and they take precedence over all issues of professional and administrative concern.

The draft statements were developed as an outgrowth of several activities: a review of the literature in the fields of special education and professional preparation; a review of existing program models, certification, and other issues; a series of regional meetings involving a wide variety of special educators; existing CEC policy statements; and information derived through the use of a Delphi Survey Instrument specifically developed for the project. *

The involvement of the field in the structuring and consideration of earlier draft guidelines has been essential. It is hoped that the following materials provide a reasonable reflection of the earlier deliberations and a basis for the continued discussions and decision processes.

---

* A sample of 1300 practitioners at all levels was surveyed. A report of Delphi study has been published as part of the PS & G project.

Draft Guideline Format

The feedback material from the regional conferences was compiled. (available to participants - regional feedback compilation document)

Following review by the Project Advisory Committee and staff, modification of the statements or alternative statements reflecting other points of view expressed were drafted. These are presented in this draft material.

The draft guideline numbers from the regional document are maintained.

A fourth section concerned with Professional Practices has been added in response to some feedback from regional participants.

In each instance, the original statement is presented (1) first, It is followed by one or more alternative statements for consideration by this work conference.

The types of alternatives are:

1. Retain statement as originally stated.
2. Retain concept; edit content.
3. Revise
   - A. Expand - broaden concept
   - B. Restrict concept
   - C. Clarify ie. divide, amalgamate
   - D. Additional concept or point of view
4. Delete item

In most instances the draft statements are followed by a draft rationale statement and some positive and negative examples. The latter are included to clarify the guideline statement by suggesting its inherent boundaries; the examples are not intended to exhaust all the possible implications of the statement but to suggest some specific applications of what might otherwise be considered an abstract idea. The positive examples are intended to indicate desirable practices by the guidelines and the negative examples indicate doubtful or unacceptable practices within the given framework. In some cases the range of alternatives is wide, the draft rationale statements and examples may not be responsive to all points of view expressed at this time.

A separately published Casebook is being prepared as part of the CEC PS&G project which will describe programs now in operation in various parts of the nation and which demonstrate particularly interesting and significant work in the area or domain of each guideline. The Casebook will thus provide more detailed examples of actual work in the field and serve as a source of information for those who wish to pursue a particular guideline for purposes of program imporvement.

Participants will review the materials in their work group and respond in a specific nature as well as identify major unresolved issues for further deliberation on Sunday.

Chapter II: THE GUIDELINES

Section] RECRUITMENT and SELECTION

This section of guideline statements is intended to cover recruitment and selection in all areas of Special Education from paraprofessional to postdoctorate. The terms 'recruitment' and 'selection' refer to both preparation and employment.

Recruitment, the active reaching out for individuals to form a pool from which selection is made, is an essential preliminary to selection for both employment and preparation programs. The qualities of people finally selected are, to a large degree, dependent upon the qualities among those who have been recruited.

At the present time there is a surplus of general teachers and some other classes of school personnel with the result that recruitment has tended to become passive. The intent of these guideline statements, is positive and active. Recruitment and selection should not be pursued in such a way as to provide a highly uniform or homogeneous set of recruits or of special educators. The assumption is that richness in a field derives, in part, from the diversities of talents, styles and interests of the people it involves in its enterprise. The is also the matter of being fair to all persons who wish to enter the processes of recruitment and selection. A specific concern is to assure the inclusion of a full range of racial and cultural groups among recruits.

1. Recruitment/Selection
1.1.1 Broad Base

1.1.1 Guideline

1	(1)	Personnel for training (paraprofessional to post-doctoral) or for practice (university researcher/ professor to teacher aides) should be actively recruited form all socio-ecenomic levels and all ethnic and racial groups.
2	(3-A)	Personnel for preparation and for practice should be recruited from all socio-economic levels and all ethnic and minority groups and with equality of opportunity for men and women.
3	(3-C)	Personnel for special education training and employment should be selected from as broad a population as possible without regard to ethnic group, race, sex, creed, handicap, or exceptionality.
4	($3\text{-}C_1$)	Personnel for special education <u>training</u> should be selected from as broad a population as possible without regard to ethnic group, race, sex, creed, handicap, or exceptionality.
5	($3\text{-}C_2$)	Personnel for special education <u>employment</u> should be selected from as broad a population as possible without regard to ethnic group, race, sex, creed, handicap, or exceptionality.
6		

1. Recruitment/Selection
1.1.1

Rationale

In the past, and in far too many cases in the present, teacher education programs have prepared white middle-class students to be teachers of white, middle-class children. Since the range of children in public schools goes far beyond the white middle-class, this is not only highly unrealistic but bound to lead to a discriminating school system. Some authors, (Smith, et al, 1969, p. 13)[1] indicate that such a situation can "unintentionally aggravate a potentially explosive division between the social classes and ethnic groups in our society." Special Education has already been accused of labeling culturally different children as retarded, so we are particularly aware of the need to include cultural and racial diversity in the power structure of the school system.

The first step in accomplishing this is in recruiting from every ethnic, racial and socio-economic group for training programs, and for positions at every level - and doing this in a way which assures equality of opportunities for the sexes.

---

[1]Smith, B. Othanial, in Collaboration with Cohen, Saul B., and Pearl, Arthur, Teachers for the Real World. AACTE, Washington, D.C., 1969.

1.1.1 Examples

Positive: Special efforts are made in a local educational agency which has mostly male administrators to recruit a "pool" of female applicants for administrative work.

A college undertakes a broad, national recruitment campaign for black and Spanish-speaking students to help diversify the student group in special education preparation.

Schools make a special effort to recruit teacher aides from minority groups and to encourage them to advance to teaching careers.

Negative: A college recruits its special education students only within the local, relatively affluent regular student population.

A city having a bi-cultural and bilingual district fails to recruit systematically for appropriately oriented and bi-lingual teachers.

1. Recruitment/Selection
1.1.2 Effectiveness with Children

1.1.2 Guideline

1	(1)	Recruitment of persons for preparation or for positions in practice should provide opportunity for upward mobility of active practitioners and for entrance of persons in related fields into special education.
2	(2)	In recruitment and selection of personnel for special education, priority should be given to persons who have demonstrated ability to work effectively with children.
3	(2)	Recruitment of persons for preparation or for positions in practice should provide opportunity for change in roles of active practitioners and for entrance of persons in related fields into special education.
4	(3-C-1)	Recruitment of persons for preparation should provide opportunity for change in roles of active practitioners and for entrance of persons in related fields into special education.
5	(3-C-2)	Recruitment of persons for employment should provide opportunity for change in roles of active practitioners and for entrance of persons in related fields into special education.
6		

1. Recruitment/Selection
1.1.2

Rationale

This guideline underlines the paramount importance of demonstrable abilities and commitments in serving children when recruiting personnel for preparation or employment in special education. It suggests that when recruiting candidates for special teacher preparation, for example, it would be well to look for paraprofessionals, regular teachers, child care workers, or others who have already demonstrated personal commitments to the welfare and development of children and who seem able to interact with them with good affect and other positive results.

It is not always possible, of course, for young people to demonstrate their abilities to relate effectively to children. They may simply not have had opportunities for work in situations where they could test themselves. This suggests that colleges and other preparation centers may want to provide settings in which very young "recruits" may be given their first chance to work with children as testing grounds for themselves and for others

1.1.2 Examples

Positive: The college special education faculty recruits for its special preparation programs regular classroom teachers who have shown exceptional concern and abilities to serve children who have unusual needs.

The LEA offers "teacher preparation" scholarships for teacher aides who have demonstrated outstanding abilities.

A child care worker in a hospital who seemed outstanding in ability to gain responses from "withdrawn" children is encouraged to prepare for a teaching position.

The college special education department arranges for freshmen and sophomores to "volunteer" in local special education agencies so that they can check out their values, abilities and commitments.

Negative: Recruitment efforts are totally "paper operation"; that is, they involve only reviews of grades, test scores and the like.

College faculty in special education are recruited on the basis of only academic qualification, with but little attention to professional performance criteria.

1. Recruitment/Selection
1.1,2 Broad Base

1.1.2.1 Guideline

1	(1)	Recruitment from all areas of education should be considered when recr iting for training programs or positions in special education.
2	($3\text{-}C\text{-}_1$)	Recruitment from all areas of education should be considered when recruiting for training programs in special education.
3	($3\text{-}C\text{-}_2$)	Recruitment from all areas of education should be considered when recruiting for employment in special education.
4	(3-A)	Recruitment from all areas of education and related disciplines should be considered when recruiting for training programs in special education.
5	(3-C)	Delete- Material covered in 1.1.2
6		

1. Recruitment/Selection
1.1.2.2 Broad Base

1.1.2.2 Guideline

1	(1)	Recruitment from related disciplines should be considered when recruiting for training programs or positions in special education.
2	(3-C-1)	Recruitment from related disciplines should be considered when recruiting for training programs in special education.
3	(3-C-2)	Provision should be made for individuals to be considered for selection for new roles as they acquire more and different competencies.
4	(3C)	Delete- Material covered in 1.1.2
5		

1. Recruitment/Selection
1.1.2.2 Mobility

1.1.2.3 Guideline

1	(1)	Provision should be made for individuals to be considered for selection for new roles as they acquire more competencies.
2	(2)	Provision should be made for individuals to be considered for selection for new roles as they acquire greater competencies.
3	(3C)	Delete- Material covered in 1.1.2
4		

1. Recruitment/Selection
1.1.2.4 Mobility

1.1.2.4 Guideline

1	(1)	Successful paraprofessionals should be given priority in the recruitment process for other positions in the recruitment process for other posistions and for teacher education programs in special education.
2	(2)	Successful paraprofessionals should be given consideration in the recruitment process for other positions and for special education training programs.
3	(2)	Successful paraprofessionals should be given serious consideration in the recruitment process to give opportunities to encourage them to prepare for other positions and for training programs in special education.
4	(3-C-1)	Successful paraprofessionals should be given consideration in the recruitment process for other positions in special education.
5	(3-C-2)	Successful paraprofessionals should be given consideration in the recruitment process for teacher education programs in special education.
6	(3-C)	Delete- Material covered in 1.1.2
7		

1.1.3 Guideline

1	(1)	Criteria to be employed in recruiting persons for preparation or for positions should be specific, based on evidence of the need in the field, and made public in advance of recruitment.
2	(2)	Criteria to be employed in recruiting and selecting special education personnel should be specific, responsive to needs of the field and made public.
3	(3-C-1)	Criteria to be employed in recruiting persons for positions should not be based upon the replacement economy but should be specific and delineate competencies expected of practitioners in the field and be made public in advance of recruitment.
4	(3-C-2)	Criteria for recruiting persons for preparation should be specific, based on evidence of a competency need in the field and made public in advance of recruitment.
5		

Rationale

This guideline pertains to recruitment and selection for both preparation and employment. It suggests that there is value in clarifying as fully as possible the situations for which the recruitment/selection is being organized. Partly this is a matter of being efficient about the whole process, so that only people with appropriate prerequisites will present themselves. It is also an economy for all involved if potential applicants can see the "criteria" or "requirements" in advance and evaluate for themselves the worthwhileness of pursuing candidacies for various roles. But it is also a matter of accountability, that is, making public the job analyses and the corresponding characteristics of applicants which will be attended to by decision makers.

Those responsible for recruitment and selection are ultimately responsible for justifying the criteria used and the decisions made on the basis of their validity; that is, assuming as much correspondence as possible between criteria used and the performances required for the education of exceptional children.

This suggests that recruitment and selection activities, just as fully as any others, need to be guided by results of research and to be carefully evaluated.

A particular problem at this time, because of the recent changes in the supply/demand ratio of teachers in general and the problems of distributing specialized teachers to places where greatest needs exist, is the coordination of manpower data with recruitment procedures. There are no easy answers in this domain, but it is reasonable to expect that manpower data should be part of the bases on which recruitment efforts are mounted.

1. Recruitment/Selection

1.1.3 Criteria

1.1.3 Examples

Positive: The LEA announces clearly that it will (or will not) give priority to applications "from the immediate school neighborhood" in selecting teacher aides.

The college seeking a new professor honestly and publicly specifies its concern for teaching ability as the primary criteria.

The State Department of Education publishes manpower data for the state as an assist to all preparation centers in planning their recruitment activities.

Negative: The college hires on "teaching ability", while promoting on research productivity - thus misleading its recruits and selectees.

The local educational agency fails to make public its strong concern for choosing special education administrators from internal ranks and thus wastes much time of "outsiders."

		1.1.3.2 Guideline
1	(1)	Recruitment for both training programs and positions should be based on a careful study of the projected needs and resources of special education.
2	(2)	Recruitment should be based on a careful study of the projected and resource needs of special education programs of a geographic area.
3	(3-C)	Recruitment for both training programs and positions should be based on a careful study of the projected needs and resources of special education and reflect the demands in the field.
4	($3\text{-}C\text{-}_2$)	Recruitment for practice should be done for specific job positions.
5	(3-C)	Delete - material covered in 1.1.3.
6		

1.1.3.3 Guideline

1	(1)	Recruitment should be done for specific job positions in a specific fashion.
2	(2)	Recruitment should be done for specifically stated competencies of a position.
3	(3-C)	Delete - material covered in 1.1.3.
4		

Selection
1.2.1 Guideline

1	(1)	Criteria to be employed in selection of persons for preparation or for positions should be specifically based on evidence of significance, and made public in advance of selection.
2	(2)	Criteria to be employed in selecting persons for preparation or for positions should be specific and made public in advance of selection. Rationales for the criteria should be given.
3	(3-C-1)	Criteria to be employed in selecting persons for preparation should include a rationale for such criteria which shall be made public in advance of selection.
4	(3-C-2)	Criteria to be employed in the selection of persons for positions should be based on evidence of specific demonstrable competencies which should be made public in advance of selection.
5	(4)	Delete this statement - retain sub-statements (1.2.1.1 - 1.2.1.4)
6		

1.2.1.1 Guideline

1	(1)	The selection criteria for admission into a special education program should be specifically stated and disseminated before the process of selection of students. Rationales for the criteria should be given.
2	(2)	The selection criteria for admission into special education program should be specifically stated and disseminated before the process of selection of students. Rationales for the criteria should be available.
3	(3-A)	The selection criteria for admission and completion of a special education program should be specifically stated and disseminated. Rationales for the criteria should be available.
4		

1.2.1.2 Guideline

1	(1)	The criteria for selection for any position at any level in special education should be clearly and specifically stated, published and disseminated in advance. Rationale for the criteria should be given.
2	(2)	The criteria for selection for any position at any level in special education should be clearly and specifically stated, published and disseminated in advance. Rationale for criteria should be available.
3	(3-B)	The criteria for selection for any position at any level in special education should be compatible with the job description and specifically stated in advance. These criteria should be determined by individuals involved in the education of exceptional children.
4		

1.2.1.3 Guideline

1	(1)	Special educators at all levels should be selected for a position on the basis of specific demonstrable competencies.
2	(3-C)	Special educators at all levels shall be selected for position on the basis of specific demonstrated competencies which reflect previously established selection criteria.
3	(3-C)	Special educators at all levels should be selected for a position on the basis of desirable competencies.
4		

1.2.1.4 Guideline

1 (1) Any evaluation used for selection should be shown to be directly related to the expected competencies needed in the position.

2 (3-C) Criteria used for selection for a position in special education should be directly related to competencies needed and the criteria established for the position.

3

1.2.2 Guideline

1	(1)	Steps in the selection process from setting criteria to final decisions, should be undertaken in concert by those who have direct responsibility and expertise appropriate to the positions or preparation for which persons are being selected.
2	(2)	Steps in the selection process from setting criteria to final decisions, should be undertaken by a representative group who have direct responsibility and expertise appropriate to the positions or preparation for which persons are being selected.
3	(3-A)	Professional special educators who have direct responsibility and expertise appropriate to the positions or preparation for which persons are being selected should participate in key decisions in the selection process from setting criteria to final decisions in concert with others such as parents and others who can contribute to the selection process.
4	(3-B)	Criteria for selection for positions should rest with professional special educators, with input from other appropriate individuals and groups.
5	(3-B-_1)	Selection for admission to training programs of personnel who meet specified criteria should be the responsibility of the appropriate university personnel.
6	(3-B-_2)	Selection for employment of personnel who meet specified criteria should be the responsibility of the local school authorities.
7	(3-C-1)	Steps in the selection process from setting criteria to final decisions, should be undertaken in concert by those who have direct responsibility and expertise appropriate to the preparation for which persons are being selected.
8	(3-C-_2)	Steps in the selection process from setting criteria to final decisions, should be undertaken in concert by those who have direct responsibility and expertise appropriate to the positions for which persons are being selected.
9		

1.2.3 Guideline

1	(1)	Included in the selection process should be a means for the ongoing evaluation of those accepted into training programs or hired for a position.
		Preparation:
2	(2)	Included in the selection process should be a means for the ongoing evaluation of both the process and those accepted.
3	(3-A)	Included in the selection process there should be a means for ongoing evaluation of the criteria for the selection process.
4	(3-C-1)	Included in the selection process should be a means for the ongoing evaluation of those accepted into training programs.
5	(3-A)	The selection process should present the ongoing evaluation and criteria for admission, retention and/or dismissal from the program.
6	(3-A)	Included in the special education preparation program should be provisions for continuous evaluation of the trainee's performance in relation to the program's objectives.
		Employment:
7	(3-C-2)	Included in the selection process should be a means for the ongoing evaluation of those hired for a position.
8	(3-A)	Included in the selection process should be a means for the ongoing evaluation of the selection criteria and of those hired for a position.
9	(3-A)	Employers should state evaluation criteria for retention and promotion in a position.
10		

Rationale 1.2.3

Ongoing evaluation is an essential element of any selection process. It provides evidence of the validity of the criteria and of the methods or instruments used to make judgments about applicants and thus becomes one of the means by which recruitment and selection processes might be improved.

1.2.3 Examples

Positive:

A college which is considering use of an aptitude test in selection process examines the test as a predictor among present students as one approach to evaluation.

A local educational agency rechecks rating scales used by "selection committees" to see if they predict performance among selectees.

An administrator is refused tenure in his administrative role when it is clear that he does not, in fact, perform adequately certain functions which he appeared to have at the time of initial selection.

Negative:

The college gives general aptitude test for entering students, but collects no validity data on it.

The LEA insists on hiring only high school graduates for paraprofessional roles, in spite of evidence showing that other characteristics might offer compensation for low academic background.

1.3 General Guidelines

1.3.1 Guideline

1	(1)	Personal adjustment with explicit criteria should be a valid consideration for selection at all levels in special education including admission to teacher education programs.
2	(3-C)	Personal adjustment based on explicit and job related criteria should be a valid consideration for selection at all levels in special education including admission to teacher education programs and these criteria should be made public.
3		

1.3.2 Guideline

1	(1)	Prior experience with children including volunteer work should be considered in the selection of new recruits to special education.
2	(2)	Prior experience with exceptional children should be considered as one of many factors in the selection of persons into special education.
3	(2)	Successful experience with children including volunteer work should be given positive consideration in the selection of new recruits to special education.
4	(3-C)	Prior successful experience in work with children such as volunteer work should be considered in the selection of new recruits to special education.
5		

1.3.3 Guideline

1	(1)	Recruitment of exceptional citizens should be considered when recruiting for special education.
2	(3-B)	Exceptional citizens should be considered when selecting candidates for special education training programs "assuming that the disability of the candidate is not incompatible with the needs of those to be served."
3	(3-B)	Exceptional individuals should not be discriminated against in the recruitment for special education.
4	(3-C)	Recruitment of exceptional individuals should be encouraged when recruiting for special education.
5		

1.3.4 Guideline

1	(1)	Academic ability should be determined in part by a specifically stated grade point average criteria.
2	(2)	Academic ability should be determined in part by a stated grade point average criteria.
3	(3-A)	Some measure of academic ability should be considered when recruiting for special education.
4	(3-A)	Academic ability should be determined by multi-criteria such as a specifically stated grade point average, the demonstration of basic academic skills, and performance on standardized tests, etc.
5	(3-A)	Academic ability should be considered in the recruitment and selection of personnel and may be determined in part by a specifically stated grade point average criterion and by the demonstration of basic academic skills.
6		

1.3.5 Guideline

1	(1)	Academic ability should be determined in part by the demonstration of basic academic skills.
2	(2)	Academic ability should be determined in part by the demonstration of basic written and oral academic skills.
3	(3-C)	Combine with 1.3.4.
4		

1.3.6 Guideline

1	(1)	A pre-requisite for the role of teacher educator in special education should be experience in teaching exceptional children.
2	(2)	The composition of training staff in special education should be such that it is consistent with the objectives of the training program. This would imply that at least some of the staff would have experience in teaching exceptional children.
3	(2)	A pre-requisite for the role of teacher educator in special education is that they should have demonstrated successful experience in teaching exceptional children.
4	(3-A)	A pre-requisite for the role of teacher educator in special education should be experience in teaching exceptional children "and a requisite for continuing direct experience with exceptional children..."
5	(3-A)	A pre-requisite for the role of teacher educator in special education should be pertinent experience in teaching both regular classroom and exceptional children.
6	(3-B)	A pre-requisite for the role of teacher educator in special education is he/she must have at least three years experience in teaching children.
7		

1.3.7 Guideline

1	(1)	A criterion for special educators at any level should be their sensitivity to individual differences.
2	(2)	A criterion for special educators at all levels should be their sensitivity and acceptance of individual differences.
3	(3-A)	A criteria for special educators at all levels should be their sensitivity and adaptability to individual cultural differences.
4		

1.3.8 Guideline

1	(1)	Special educators at any level should have an awareness of cultural diversity.
2	(2)	Special educators at all levels should have an awareness of and an ability to positively deal with cultural diversity.
3	(3-C)	Combine with 1.3.7.
4		

1.3.9 Guideline

1 (1) In areas where English is the second language, fluency in the first language is a desireable competency.

2 (2) In geographic areas where English is the second language of a sizeable number of students, fluency in the first language is a desireable competency for special educators.

3

2.0 THE PREPARATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL

The focus of this section is the critical topic of the preparation[1] of special education personnel. Both preservice and inservice education are considered. A distinction between the two is made only when it is relevant on the assumption that most principles or standards of preparation apply equally to both. Indeed, the preparation of professional personnel should be one intact sequence; it should be a continuum that spans preservice and inservice educational activities.

The results of the recent DELPHI survey suggest that special and regular educators anticipate greater emphasis in the future on the continuing education side of the continuum as opposed to the preservice. The surge of interest may be a reaction, in part, to the reduced turnover of school personnel that has occurred during the past several years. With relatively fewer new people entering the field, it will be possible for resources to be shifted to continuing education to do things long dreamt of. But, the greater interest in continuing education may also reflect the desire of educational personnel to upgrade their qualifications and fit themselves for changing roles in our rapidly changing schools; for example, to serve the very severely handicapped children now being enrolled in day school programs or to conduct new forms of service to moderately handicapped children. In any case, DELPHI respondents gave "increased continuing education" a very high rating of 5.0[2] on "likelihood" and an extremely high rating of 6.7[2] on "desirability."

The DELPHI survey also included a question (items # 76-79) to produce data on how preparation activities were valued in comparison with other functions or activities of institutions for higher education. The item asked respondents to specify the proportion of total special education resources in colleges and universities which they believed should be allocated to various functions, including preparation. The averages for all respondents on Round I were as follows:

Preparation of special education personnel	39.5%
Direct Services	29.9%
Research and Development	19.6%
Policy Development	11.0%

It may be surprising to some people that the respondents allocated one-fifth of the hypothetical college resources for research and development and as much as 30 percent for direct services to schools, exceptional children, and parents.

---

[1] Although the term "preparation" is preferred, on occasions in this paper the term "training" is also used, with synonymous meaning.

[2] On a scale of 7.

A further question on the DELPHI survey (items # 80-85) asked respondents to subdivide the special education preparation resources of colleges and universities among certain general classes of personnel. In effect, they were asked to say how important it was for the colleges to prepare paraprofessionals, teachers, and others. The averaged results were as follows:

Special education teachers	34.8%
Regular teachers	21.5%
Teacher educators	11.6%
Paraprofessionals	11.0%
Special education administrators	10.9%
Researchers	10.3%

These results suggest that roughly two-thirds of the training resources should be assigned to personnel who work directly with exceptional children: special education teachers, regular teachers, and paraprofessionals. The percentage allotted to the preparation of regular teachers seems to indicate a belief that they should be involved in the education of exceptional children also.

The policies or guidelines discussed in this chapter are intended to apply to any agency, person, or group of persons who controls or conducts preparation activities. The term "preparation center" is used as a generic descriptor for colleges, universities, state departments of education, local educational agencies, professional organizations, and all other agencies that may conduct any kind of preparation activities in special education. Obviously, preparation now goes on in a wide variety of agencies and there is always some tension among them over how much control and actual preparation activity should be conducted by each. We assume that control will be exercised in sensitive and generous collaboration among all of the agencies involved (see Guideline 2.1.3)

The guidelines say very little about either the general education of personnel for the field of special education or their general orientation to professional education. Instead, attention is given almost exclusively to the specialized preparation that is needed in addition to strong general education and to such professional preparation as might be common to regular educators. This is not to say that there is no concern for the general educational prerequisites for special education training. Indeed, the bias is strongly in favor of the highest practicable standards for the general education of persons who wish to enter the field of special education; the focus here is quite specific to special education.

Readers are reminded (see Chapter I for a more extended statement) that the suggested guidelines are oriented to process rather than content; that is, they specify procedures by which high-quality preparation programs might be provided rather than a national standard of specific competencies for various categories of personnel. The assumption is that rigid outlines of specific competencies at a national level are best avoided so the field can

be kept open to innovation within a strong framework of process standards. It is understood, of course, that preparation centers, state certification offices and others at state and local levels will need to specify particular sets of competencies.

The guidelines offer a rigorous and systematic approach to the planning and operation of preparation programs for special education personnel. Systems approaches are often accused of using rhetoric and logic at the expense of the qualitative aspects of human interactions. Indeed, there is a great deal of valid concern that systems approaches should not be permitted to become so narrowly quantitative and all pervasive in teacher education and kindred fields as to foster neglect of personal commitments and values, and the quality of human interactions in the educational enterprise. The assumption is made here that all preparation programs for special education personnel should proceed in a context of deep commitment to the equal worthiness and dignity of every human being, and that the very processes of the preparation should demonstrate that commitment. It is further assumed that the application of systematic processes in program planning, operation, and evaluation can be creative and liberating rather than stultifying and confining in its effects. Thus, while urging systematic approaches to preparation, the intent is to enhance rather than to diminish humanistic values.

2.1 General Considerations in Preparation Programs

Before proceeding into the specialized aspects of guidelines for preparation programs, this section focuses briefly on several more general items. First noted is the fact that exceptional children do not spend their entire educational lives in the charge of special educators. Like other children, most of them spend most of their lives in homes with parents and siblings and in neighborhoods with friends and neighbors. Some of them spend much time in hospitals or other special centers, with child care workers, physicians, nurses, social workers, cooks, and janitors. Large numbers of exceptional children spend much time in regular classes and regular schools. Thus it seems appropriate that some of the preparation program resources in the field of special education should go to this broad set of persons who, in fact, make important contributions in the support system and education of exceptional children. The first guideline of this section acknowledges that broad responsibility.

2. Preparation
2.1.1 General Considerations

2.1.1 Guideline

1	(1)	Special educators should contribute to the "education" of regular teachers, school administrators, parents, community leaders, legislators, and the public at large in ways that will help to create acceptance and support for exceptional persons as part of community life.
2	(2)	Special educators should help to create acceptance and support for exceptional persons as part of community life.
3	(2)	Special educators should interact with regular teachers, school administrators, parents, community leaders, legislators, and the public at large in ways that will help to create awareness and understanding for exceptional persons as part of community life.
4	(2)	Special educators should help to create acceptance and support for exceptional persons as part of community life, through communication with regular teachers, school administrators, parents, community leaders, legislators and the public at large.

2 Preparation
2.1 General Considerations

2.1.1 Rationale

Exceptional children live in a great variety of communities, some in special centers but most in the natural community of family, home, and neighborhood. Wherever they live, they need and deserve to be understood and to be treated as valued participants in all facets of their community's life. This guideline suggests that special educators have an obligation to join with others to share whatever special insights might contribute to the development of the community's capacity to deal with exceptionality.

A particular responsibility at this time is to share in the development of more accommodative capacity for exceptionality in regular school settings. The Delphi survey showed an expectation that more children with mild and moderate degrees of handicaps will be educated in regular classes, particularly as systems for individual instruction are broadly implemented in regular education. Special educators must carry a heavy portion of the responsibility for creating broadly based support systems in the regular schools by helping to provide the necessary orientation, training, and advocacy.

2. Preparation
2.1 General Considerations

2.1.1 Examples

Positive: A professor of special education develops a training module on services for exceptional children which can be used by general community groups that conduct educational programs.

An association of special educators launches a carefully designed TV series to inform the general public of aspects of exceptionality among children.

A local director of special education makes frequent presentations to local parent groups on topics that help to link the efforts of schools and homes.

Experienced school bus and cab drivers help to provide background for new drivers who may be called upon to transport handicapped children.

Negative: A special teacher tutors referred children in an isolated setting and hardly knows other teachers in the building.

A local director of special education takes pride in the fact that his superintendent always professes ignorance about special education but has "full confidence" in his specialists.

---

2. Preparation
2.1 General Considerations

2.1.2 Guideline

1	(1)	Training centers in special education should conduct training for non-special educators, such as regular teachers, pupil personnel workers, and general school administrators, to help them become more responsive to the needs of exceptional children.
2	(2)	Preparation centers in special education should participate in the education of non-special educators, such as regular teachers, pupil personnel workers, and general school administrators, to help them become more effective in meeting the needs of exceptional children.
3	(2)	Training centers in special education should participate in training for non-special educators such as regular teachers, pupil personnel workers and general school administrators, so as to develop effective joint responses to the needs of all children.
4	(2)	College and university departments of special education and other educational agencies that conduct preparation and orientation programs relating to exceptional children should carry prime responsibility for contributing to the preparation of non-special education personnel on topics that are relevant to the needs of exceptional children in the local school system.
5		

2. Preparation
2.1 General Considerations

2.1.2 Rationale

College departments of special education and other educational agencies that conduct training and orientation programs relating to exceptional children carry particular responsibility for contributing to the education of non-specialists on topics that are relevant to the needs of exceptional children. In the DELPHI survey (items # 80-85), the respondents suggested that colleges should allocate 21.5% of their training resources to the education of regular teachers; the corresponding figure for preparing special teachers was 34.8%.

In the 1971 report of the Canadian Committee on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, the importance of making provisions for the preparation of regular teachers to serve exceptional children was a recurring theme.[5]

> ...it should be mandatory that improved teacher education programs be developed and made available to practicing teachers as well as student teachers. All teachers need a general awareness of and knowledge about exceptional children (p. 89).

What is said of regular teachers applies at least equally to school psychologists, counselors and social workers, general administrators and supervisors,paraprofessionals, and lay leaders in education. At a time when the right to education is being extended literally to all children, often on court orders, it is encumbent upon all decision makers in the schools to be informed on and skilled in creating school environments that are genuinely and warmly inclusive of all children.

---

[5] Hardy, M. I., et al. Standards for educators of exceptional children. Downsview, Ontario: The National Institute on Mental Retardation (York University Campus, 4700 Keefe Street),1971.

2.1.2 Examples

Positive: College departments of special education and elementary education jointly offer an introductory course and practicum in special education for all elementary education majors in the college.

A series of training institutes on "new models" of special education service is conducted for school principals by a state department of education special education staff.

A local director of special education organizes a series of program visits and seminars on programs for exceptional children for the school superintendent, the board of education, and other members of the central administrative cabinet.

Negative: A "teacher center" is created for the purpose of planning and conducting inservice education for a school district; but the special education program does not join it.

The college develops its own clinic for studies of exceptional children rather than helping to develop the psycho-educational center which is used in cooperation with the training programs of other departments.

Inservice education funds in special education for local schools are exhausted in programs for special teachers and no services are provided to regular teachers.

---

2. Preparation
2.1 General Considerations

2.1.3 Guideline

1	(1)	The planning of special education preparation programs should involve representatives of all the parties influenced by the planning.
2	(2)	The planning of special education preparation programs should include opportunities for input from representatives of all of the persons or groups affected by the planning.
3	(3-A)	The planning of special education preparation programs should involve representation with appropriate power and decision making authority of all the parties influenced by the planning, including the consumer.
4	(3-B)	The planning of special education preparation programs should involve representatives of all the parties influenced by the planning in an advisory capacity.
5		

2. Preparation
2.1 General Considerations

2.1.3 Rationale

One of the clearest developments in our society in recent decades has been the rise of the consumer or client in claiming the right to participate in policy making. Wars are too important to be left to the generals and schools are too important to be left exclusively to administrators and teachers! The rights of the child and his parents to a significant voice in the school decisions that affect him have been secured in recent court cases guaranteeing "due process." CEC policy expressed the following attitude toward such developments as they affect special education:

> One of the most significant and promising developments in our society is the steady extension of participation in policy making to consumers of services. It is healthy and desirable that parents and lay groups should make their particular concerns known and have a part in policy formation.[6]

Unless provisions are made for external voices to be heard and given weight, it is likely, for example, that preparation centers might become increasingly self-centered and self-serving. On the other hand, the preparation center that opens itself to the influence of current and former students, employers and potential employers of its graduates, and parents and teachers of exceptional children, and the public at large, is likely to receive much useful advice which can be used to build stronger programs of all kinds; and in the process it will have gained supporters instead of critics. This counsel applies equally to colleges and all other agencies that provide entry level preparation for the profession or inservice education to practicing professionals and their staffs. Nothing bodes better for success that the involvement of affected persons in the planning stages, nor anything for failure more than neglect of such prior consultation.

Increasingly, special educators are being required to proceed in parity with parents of exceptional children in making plans for children. This trend necessitates that all special educators be well-prepared for cooperative planning with parents.

[6]CEC, Basic commitments and responsibilities to exceptional Children. Available at CEC offices, Reston, Virginia.

2.1.3 Examples

Positive: A local supervisor of learning disability programs uses representatives of the teachers in the program and of parents to plan inservice education programs for the school year.

Representative special education bus drivers, parents, and handicapped students meet to agree upon rules for behavior on the busses and to design the necessary training program for all personnel

---

College students majoring in special education belong to an organization through which they elect representatives to work in the curriculum committee of the department of special education.

The state department of education seeks the advice of special education students, teachers, administrators, and parents to plan a sequence of training institutes for the year

---

A college department of special education invites students, local school administrators, local teachers, recent graduates, and handicapped persons to join the faculty in making decisions about priorities and possible new programs for teacher preparation. All have equal voting power.

A junior college staff that conducts training for paraprofessionals works closely with teachers and supervisors from the nearby residential school for the handicapped, parents, and current and former students to plan program revisions.

Negative: A state department of education unilaterally decides that all training programs supported on "flow thru" funds from the federal agencies shall be evaluated in accordance with a single model.

A college faculty decides unilaterally on revisions of its preparation programs.

A local administrator announces a new inservice education program for teachers which has no teacher "input" on needs and desires.

A faculty group invites "outsiders" to help in the general planning of new preparation programs, but gives them only limited advisory roles.

2.1.4 Guidelines

1 (1) Patterns of professional interaction that should be expected to occur in school programs for exceptional children, such as among special teachers, regular teachers, school psychologists, speech pathologists, principals, and community resource personnel, should also occur in preparation programs so that the various specialists can enter their work as understanding partners.

2 (2) Cooperative inter-professional approaches that should be expected to occur in programs for exceptional children, among various specialists such as teachers, school psychologists, speech pathologists, principals, medical personnel and community resource personnel, should also be reflected in preparation programs.

3 (2) Preparation programs should allow for interdisciplinary interaction at the training level so that the various specialists can enter their work as understanding partners.

4

2.1.4 Rationale

An assumption in this guideline is that school programs for exceptional children are planned and conducted, most often, by persons from several professions, along with the students themselves and their parents. For example, if a regular teacher requested help through a school principal, he might call upon a psychologist, physician, speech pathologist, or other specialist to provide it. The "team" might involve as many as half a dozen or more persons who would work together to try to understand a child and to create a useful school environment for him. There may be instances in which all of the study and decisions are made by a single all-powerful individual, but such cases probably should be rare.

A frequently recurring problem in special education programs is that the staff expected to work together have not been trained to cooperate. Many specialists from education and other fields who are involved in the diagnosis of and program planning for exceptional children have been trained in isolated professional groupings and, as a result, have little appreciation for each profession's potential contributions. Too frequently, the related professions are discovered "on the job" and with great difficulty.

An obvious solution to this isolation is to create more and better interactions among specialized preparation programs. It is not too much to ask that special educators, school psychologists, counselors, and school principals, among others, spend some time studying and working together both at the preservice and inservice levels. This cooperation is healthy for trainees and their instructors as well.

2.1.4 Examples

Positive: Practicum stations are arranged to bring together students from the several specializations for experience.

Regular teachers and school principals are included in inservice training activities designed to help in diagnosing and prescribing school programs for exceptional children.

Residents in pediatrics, school psychologists, and social workers come to the educational clinic on campus to begin learning how to work effectively with school personnel.

A common set of professionally oriented courses is offered to students in special education, school psychology, school counseling, and speech therapy.

Teacher aides are invited to participate in "case conference" sessions along with teachers, psychologists, and others.

The inservice education program in a city school system involves close coordination among special educators, psychologists, counselors, and social workers through many joint sessions.

Negative: School psychology and special education departments organize practicums in different settings but fail to share knowledges and skills.

Counselor trainers and special education professors send students into schools with conflicting concepts of consultation processes.

Special education teacher trainees do their training in a conveniently available hospital setting and have no interactions with other types of school personnel.

---

2. Preparation
2.1 General Considerations

2.1.5 Guidelines

1	(1)	Preparation programs for special educators should be broadly oriented so that trainees are prepared to make useful contributions in a variety of roles and administrative arrangements. Trainees should also be prepared to help plan programs for children who show a variety of exceptionalities.
2	(2)	In addition to specialized preparation, special educators should be prepared to make useful contributions in a variety of roles and learning enviroments and to help plan programs for children who show a variety of exceptionalities.
3	(2)	Preparation programs for special educators should be broadly oriented so that trainees are prepared to make useful contributions in a variety of settings and administrative arrangements.
4	(2)	Preparation programs should have a reasonable balance between special and general preparation so that the practitioner develops unique competency as well as ability to contribute appropriately to the planning and implementation of programs for exceptional children.
5		

2.1.5 Rationale

An employer's common complaint, especially when attempts are being made to change programs in constructive ways, is that special educators tend to be too narrow in their training and commitments. For example, a teacher prepared and certified for special class teaching may avow the inability to move into a broadly framed resource teaching situation which has been designed to serve children from the various traditional categories of handicapping conditions. Or, an administrator prepared to work as a local special education director may feel unprepared to work at the state or federal level or at a local college.

The fact is that few individuals spend their total careers in one kind of situation; and in the world of the future, it is even less likely that any given situation will remain static and thus offer career-long stability to anyone. The field of special education is changing very rapidly and special educators necessarily must be broadly resourceful and ready for change. The preparation of special education teachers, for example, should equip them to serve in a variety of administrative arrangements, such as the resource room, special class, residential school, or treatment center.

Results on the DELPHI survey showed that many current special class teachers can be expected to take on more consultative functions with regular teachers; this trend was rated as "desirable" (mean rating 5.4). The response suggests that roles which are defined by and limited to some fixed administrative arrangement may not be viable for the future.

Still another aspect of the problem of enhancing the generalization of special teacher functioning concerns the potentialities of a core program of preparation which specifies a general set of competencies for all special education teachers. The Canadian Professional Standards Committee referred to the "multitude of more or less independent preparation programs" as "an historical accident;" and they argued strongly for a broad core program in the preparation of all special education teachers.

> Insofar as historically distinguishable categories of exceptional children share common characteristics and needs, so should the preparation of their teachers have common elements, and insofar as exceptional children as a whole share common characteristics with non-exceptional children, so should the basic preparation program... have many elements in common with programs for regular teachers.[7]

---

[7] Hardy, op. cit., pp. 12-13

2.1.5 Rationale (cont.)

The DELPHI survey showed that the respondents hold rather favorable sentiments toward the idea that a core program might be created to replace "at least half of the categorical instruction" now offered in colleges and universitities. The mean rating on the "likelihood" of this "event" was 4.7, and on "desirability," 5.3.

The variety of models which are now emerging give substance to the notion of core programs. A surge in the development of core concepts and programs occurred in 1971 when the Training Division of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped of the U.S. Office of Education announced that it would offer financial support for bloc as well as traditional categorical programs. Soon thereafter a number of the emerging core programs were described at a conference on "Innovative Non-Categorical and Interrelated Projects in the Education of the Handicapped," sponsored by Florida State University.[8] Examples of several more recently developed approaches to core programs are included in a book edited by Deno[9] and the projected Casebook.[10] The key concept in all core programs is the individualization of instruction.

It is not argued that each and every special educator should possess all possible competencies. At the least, however, they should be able to give some help in all areas of exceptionality, including the gifted and talented, as well as in the particular areas in which they have concentrated their competencies.

---

[8] Schwartz, L., et. al., Innovative non-categorical and interrelated projects in the education of the handicapped. Tallahassee: College of Education, Florida State University, 1972.

[9] Deno, E. (Ed.), Instructional alternatives for exceptional children. Reston, Va.: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1973.

[10] To be published as part of the CEC Professional Standards and Guidelines Project.

2.1.5 Examples

Positive: The inservice education program includes training in consulting functions so special class teachers can assume broader roles in the school, including consultation with regular teachers.

All trainees in a specialized teacher preparation program are given practicum experiences in schools, hospitals, parent counseling centers, and public schools.

Because of special skills in the individualization of instruction, a special education teacher is able to serve as a unit leader in a school in which the Individually Guided Education (IGE) system[11] is being installed.

All special education trainees, including those who wish to specialize in service to the handicapped, are given some background in working with the gifted and talented.

Teacher trainees spend time in a "behavior modification" laboratory, a resource room, and a special class.

Negative: A special education administrative trainee is given field experience only in a local agency, on the assumption that he will spend his total career in that kind of situation.

A special teacher, claiming competencies only in "special class teaching," rejects consultative functions relating to regular teachers.

A specialist in teaching disturbed children is prepared only for psychiatric hospital work.

The aide who has been employed in an "orthopedic" school rejects temporary service in a school situation for the blind on the basis of inadequate orientation.

---

[11] Developed at the University of Wisconsin Research and Development Center and disseminated with the aid of the Kettering Foundation.

2.2 Needs Assessment

In the past quarter of a century in the United States, the number of specialized teachers employed in teaching exceptional children has increased about 600 percent, and the increases in the numbers of special education administrators, supervisors, and college teachers in the field probably have been correspondingly as great. So rapid has been the rate of program development that almost any preparation program for special education personnel has been welcomed and given generous accolades for its help in meeting the widespread needs.

The context for preparation programs appears to be changing, however. In some communities, the demand for additional special education personnel has declined from the high peaks of the 1960s while the supply has remained relatively high. In other regions, the shortage of personnel to conduct special education programs has remained substantial. Thus, a new kind of problem--a personnel distribution problem--is looming as a major concern for the first time.

It is also increasingly apparent that the relatively simple models for teacher preparation which have been followed in recent decades are far from satisfactory. Graduates of the programs, for example, tend to be quite critical and to feel that many improvements could be made. At the same time a variety of schools, colleges, and state departments, with help from federal grants, have been enabled to develop new models for the training of special education personnel. These models are now ready for dissemination and adoption.

These and other trends have increased the importance of needs assessments as part of the process of developing and renewing preparation programs for special education personnel. Needs assessment applies not only to the basic manpower supply problem--how many new teachers and others are needed and where--but also to every facet of continuing preparation.

2. Preparation
2.2 Needs Assessment

2.2.1 Guidelines

1	(1)	Programs for the preparation of special education personnel should be based on systematic and continuing needs assessments.
2	(2)	Programs for both the preservice and inservice preparation of special education personnel should be based on systematic and continuing needs assessment.
3	(2)	Programs for the preparation of special education personnel should be based on systematic and continuing needs assessments: state, regional, national, and international.
4	(3-A)	Programs for the preparation of special education personnel should be based on systematic and continuing needs assessments of exceptional children and the personnel involved under the provisions of equal educational opportunity.
5	(3-B)	Programs for the preparation of special education personnel should be based on systematic and continuing needs assessments so long as that need is not based solely on the replacement economy.
6		

2. Preparation
2.2 Needs Assessment

2.2.1 Rationale

Preparation centers are less free to define their practices unilaterally than they were in the past. Support for each program must be justified with well-documented evidence of needs, competent performance, and utility of practice--criteria which apply to special education. The key concept is to base new preparation programs and to set priorities for existing programs on careful assessments which must be made of the needs of exceptional children and the personnel available to serve them.

One aspect of the needs assessment problem arises at the very beginning of any preparation activity, that is, in deciding whether the program is needed at all. There is much sentiment at this time for trimming down the number of different centers engaged in general teacher preparation in order to conserve resources and to build really strong programs at relatively fewer places. The field of special education needs to give careful attention also to the desirability of institutional specialization in preparation programs, and part of the data necessary for decisions in this domain will come from assessments of the needs of children.

But needs assessment, as the term is used here, refers also to the quality of existing preparation programs. Systematic attention should be given to gaps and inadequacies in existing programs so that unmet needs may be identified and fulfilled through corrective action.

A critical aspect of needs assessment in the context of the 1970's is the examination of needs of on-the-job special education personnel for continuing and inservice education. This guideline is intended to refer to needs over the whole spectrum of preparation activities as special education personnel develop through their careers.

2.2.1 Examples

Positive: A local director of special education supports an intensive study of problems and needs as a prelude to a major program revision; the plans for a series of inservice education activities are based on the findings.

A state department of education regularly queries all local directors of special education to assess their needs for inservice training.

A college special education staff regularly assesses needs and demands for new special education personnel in the area or region they serve.

The training center checks on the strengths and weaknesses of its recent trainees with a view toward redesigning preparation programs to meet needs more effectively.

Negative: A college special education department sustains a large program in a given domain despite evidence of sharply reduced needs in the area.

A college launches a new training program in a specialty area which is already well covered by other colleges and in which there is already enough healthy competition.

A series of training institutes on phases of program evaluation is launched for special education administrators although only one-third of them have the essential prerequisite knowledge.

2.2.2 Guidelines

1	(1)	Institutions that serve as preparation centers for special education personnel in any given region or state should cooperate in assembling data on manpower needs and training resources.
2	(2)	Preparation centers for special education personnel should cooperate in assembling data on manpower needs. 12
3	(2)	Preparation centers for special education personnel in any given region or state should cooperate in assembling accurate data on national and local manpower needs and training resources.
4		

2.2.2 Rationale

When several training centers in a state or region have common interests in needs assessment data, it may be sensible to develop a coordinated approach to the study of needs. Minimum data for a state, for example, might include the number of special education personnel employed in the various categories and classifications, the annual turnover rate in each class, and the program development (new program) rates. Extrapolations of the demand for personnel could be made from these data. Beyond these basics, a great deal of information would be desirable on such matters as the characteristics and locations of exceptional children not being served, the characteristics of personnel on duty and their inservice education needs and desires, and the training implications of new program trends. Besides statewide or regional studies, each training center would need to make its own needs assessments or, at the minimum, to look at the gaps and inadequacies in its existing programs.

The most difficult problems of needs assessment and planning occur in the case of the extremely low-incidence exceptionalities or the most highly specialized training needs. In some areas, such as the preparation of specialized teachers for the visually handicapped, there may be a need for no more than six to ten fully developed preparation centers for the nation, and even they may well each have a singular sub-specialization. The problem is to develop a sensible and responsible pattern of preparation programs in such fields so that every child who needs services by a highly specialized educator will, in fact, receive the service he needs no matter where he resides.

An assumption made here is that the solution to the problem ought to be reached through voluntary procedures and structures to the extent that it is feasible. In other words, the preparation centers in low incidence fields ought to concert their planning on a national basis in the same way that institutions within a state or given locality should. However, the U. S. Office of Education has a special responsibility to use its training resources in the low-incidence areas to meet the ultimate test of making sure that children needing specialized teaching services actually receive them. It is preferable for the U. S. Office of Education to foster voluntary coordination efforts by training centers than to impose rigid hierarchical plans in which bureaucratic definitions and allocations of responsibility govern special education.

---

[12] See section 2.3, "Resource Analysis," for further discussion.

2. Preparation
2.2 Needs Assessment

2.2.2 Examples

Positive: All colleges of a state cooperate with the State Department of Education to establish a basic system for estimating special education teacher turnover, need, and demand for the state.

The several local colleges and the local director of special education in a city collaborate in a needs assessment and planning program relating to inservice teacher education programs to be conducted over the next several years.

Professional organizations regularly assemble data on manpower needs in special education and they promote the discussion of approaches to meet the revealed needs.

Colleges and universities with extensive resources for teacher-training in a low-incidence area establish cooperative national manpower needs assessments and planning systems in their fields.

Negative: Two local colleges continue to turn out "EMR" teachers although all local schools are saturated with such specialists but short on the supply of others.

Four colleges in the same state launch new training programs for teachers of the profoundly handicapped without carefully formulated manpower data.

A state department of education launches a manpower study of special education without involving institutions of higher education.

Directors of preparation centers in a low-incidence exceptionality area take no responsibility for national needs assessment and planning while claiming national impact.

2.2.3 Guidelines

1 (1) In assessing needs for continuing education, attention should be given not only to the interests and needs of individual staff members but also to the total training needs of a school or other agency which serves exceptional children.

2 (2) In assessing needs for continuing and inservice education, attention should be given to the total training needs of schools and agencies that serve exceptional children as well as to the interests and needs of individual staff members.

3

2.2.3 Rationale

In the past, colleges and universities have tended to conduct needs assessment in terms of needs or demands for new manpower rather than meeting the total training needs of schools or other agencies in an integrated way. They have also tended to "admit" to preparation individuals rather than agency staffs as a whole. The assumption seems to be that one person, equipped with the skills, insights, and competencies to conduct a new program, can change any institution. In fact, however, no complex system can be restructured if only one or a few staff members are oriented to change. For colleges and universities to make admissions on the basis of agency needs, substantial changes in policy would be required. If all exceptional children are to be served, it seems clear that the needs of the institutions serving them must be met.

Preparation activities of schools and other agencies have more often given careful attention to the total configuration of needs in an educational program, but even here it is desirable that needs be specified more fully and in comprehensive fashion.

2.2.3 Examples

Positive: A preparation center agrees to participate in the analysis of the inservice training needs of the total staff of a residential school for exceptional children, and to undertake the necessary training without reference to its usual standards for the admission of individuals to training sequences.

A preparation center redesigns its summer preparation programs to serve a set of school districts that want to change and upgrade their "learning disability" programs.

The state department of education dedicates funds to support retraining for the entire staff of the state-operated diagnostic and reception center for socially maladjusted children.

Negative: A college commits itself to cooperate in a training program which is part of a broad change effort in a given school district, but then it refuses to admit to training certain individuals who have tenure in the system but who do not meet traditional standards for admission to graduate study.

A college insists on training only individuals of "high promise" and gives no attention to institutional needs.

2.3 Resource Analysis

It is encumbent upon preparation centers not only to conduct needs assessments but also to analyze their resources and those of other centers before they launch new programs and make priority decisions on existing programs. Need alone does not justify a new preparation program; resources must be adequate and other aspects of planning must be favorable before a "go" decision on a preparation venture is justified. Preparation centers must be prepared to justify their decisions on programs conducted or to be conducted not only on the basis of careful needs assessments but also in resource analyses.

2. Preparation
2.3 Resource Analysis

2.3.1 Guidelines

1	(1)	Training centers that conduct preparation programs for special education personnel should do so only in those domains in which they possess or develop adequate resources and use them effectively to support instruction.
2	(2)	Centers that conduct preparation programs for special education personnel should do so only in those domains in which they have demonstrably adequate resources and use them effectively to support instruction.
3	(2)	Preparation centers that conduct preparation programs for special education personnel must do so only in those domains in which they possess or develop adequate resources.
4		

2.3.1 Rationale

It is, of course, a virtual impossibility for any center to have all the necessary resources to offer all needed kinds of specialized training. A degree of specialization among training centers is required, consequently. The initial consideration is that specialized training be offered only in areas in which the center's resources are adequate. This is to say that training centers can serve best when each develops fully its resources and offerings in a limited set of areas, rather than spreading its resources thinly over too many programs. The investment required for the development and maintenance of vital program elements in just one or a few areas is high.

Beyond mere possession of the necessary resources, however, is the matter of their effective use in instruction. Special education trainees cannot be expected to use appropriate media for their instruction, do ERIC searches, or read microfische materials unless they experience these activities as a regular part of their preparation experience. Training centers are obligated to create environments in which appropriate resources can be used routinely by both trainers and trainees. An important aspect of this imperative, of course, is that training centers support the development of all necessary resources--personnel to provide needed instruction and techniques and secretarial services as well as physical resources. In sum, the total instructional environment in the training center should provide a model of excellence which trainees will carry into their own work.

2.3.1 Examples

Positive: The preparation center staff regularly checks the holdings of all local libaries which are used by special education personnel and recommends necessary acquisitions.

A college launches a new program for the preparation of teachers of the severely handicapped only after receiving commitments t collaborate from the medical school, a private demonstration school, and the local school district.

Trainees prepare project reports in appropriate media and are evaluated, in part, on their knowledge and skills in media usage.

A training center decides not to prepare teachers in the specializations of braille and mobility training because the only persons available for faculty positions are local practitioners who are already committed heavily to service programs.

A college of education decides to limit its teacher preparation programs to those relating to hearing problems because of the assured cooperation of a distinguished private school for the deaf, a superior local public school program, strong departments of audiology and otolaryngology, and insufficient resources to do a superior job in more than one field.

Negative: A college launches a new teacher education program that mainly uses as faculty local teachers of handicapped children on "overload" assignment and pay.

A local school launches inservice education for its teachers with no one really in charge or accountable and with only limited investments in staff.

A college starts its fourth special education preparation program, even though two of its first three programs are barely accredited at state level and have been refused federal approval and support.

Trainers lack basic support services, including secretarial help.

2.3.2 Guidelines

1	(1)	Trainings centers for special education personnel should use general instructional resources to the maximum and reserve only highly specialized topics for instruction in special education.
2	(2)	Preparation centers for special education personnel should maximize the use of general instructional resources and concentrate on specialized topics for instruction in special education.
3		

2.3.2 Rationale

For several reasons it is a mistake to assume that all the resources needed for special education training are highly specialized and properly under the proprietorship of special educators. In the college environment, special education depends upon the liberal arts and science faculties for a general education program for its students, and upon the professional college of education for the basic orientation and skills requisite for teaching. In preparation centers of all kinds, it is wise for special educators to take advantage of available resources in a variety of fields, such as, child development, psychology, physical medicine, genetics, linguistics, mathematics, educational psychology, reading instruction, and others, because, in part, greater integrity in training is likely when components are taught by dedicated scholars and practitioners in a special area.

It is assumed that the use of a broad range of training resources will reflect active cooperation by instructors across the several departments or disciplines. Further, it is assumed that the enrollment of special education trainees in a wide variety of courses will encourage the diffusion of concern for and attention to the needs of exceptional persons among many academic units.

The special education resources which are required over and above the general programs are still substantial; and they are likely to be of better quality if they are built into an active, larger structure at the training center. The main point of emphasis here is that special educators should reserve most of their instructional for strictly "special" topics. The extreme negative case is one in which the special education training center offers its "own" courses in areas commonly covered by other departments or centers. The extreme positive case would be one in which the special education unit enjoys full cooperation, understanding, and support by other departments and is able to concentrate its attention and resources on specialized topics.

2.3.2 Examples

Positive: In a special education teacher preparation program, components relating to specialized methods of instruction in basic skill subjects (e.g., teaching reading and mathematics) are also used in the advanced training of students in elementary education and remedial instruction.

Modules used in the preparation of specialists in public administration are also used in a special education administrator preparation program.

Special education trainees take a common basic course in childhood language development with trainees in psychology, child development and speech therapy.

Negative: The special education department of a college offers its courses on Binet and WISC testing just for its own students, while school psychology students take a different set of courses.

The psychology and special education departments offer different introductory courses for their separate students on the psychology of mental retardation.

The special education preparation center faculty teaches units on topics in which it lacks expertise (such as genetics, psycholinguistics, or psychometrics) but in which specialists are available in other parts of the community.

The special education preparation center offers all of the required instruction for teachers in reading, writing, and social studies and uses none of the offerings on the same subjects in the department of elementary education.

---

2. Preparation
2.3 Resource Analysis

2.3.3 Guidelines

1	(1)	Training centers should undertake programs for the preparation of special education personnel on the basis of planning that includes awareness of the resources and committments of other institutions, which may have similar missions and programs.
2	(2)	In initiating and revising programs for the preparation of special education personnel, preparation centers should be aware of the resources and commitments of other preparation centers and cooperatively aim at creating balanced and comprehensive programs.
3	(2)	Preparation centers should develop programs for the preparation of special education personnel on the basis of knowledge of the resources and committments of other institutions which may have similar missions and programs.
4	(2)	Centers should undertake programs of preparation of special education personnel on the basis of comprehensive state and regional planning.
5		

2. Preparation
2.3 Resource Analysis

2.3.3 Rationale

Resource analyses undertaken at any training center should extend to other training centers of the same locality, region, or state. Other institutions may already have or be in the process of developing specialized resources which it would be wasteful to duplicate. Awareness of resources in other centers may suggest collaborative programs, the balancing of programs in complementary areas, or simply a negative decision on program duplication. The staff in state departments of education may be in a position to be particularly aware of needs for interinstitutional awareness and planning, and to convene the necessary planning groups to overcome problems. It is not intended that programs should be operated in such a way as to prevent competition. Some amount of competition among preparation centers, particularly if they are very well staffed and represent distinctly different models or points of view in a field, is undoubtedly healthy.

The problem of interinstitutional awareness and planning is relevant not just to decisions about new programs but, equally, to problems of balancing efforts among existing programs to meet the needs of children. Perhaps the worst of all possible situations is for all training centers to shift as one, in bandwagon style, from one favored program to another; such a shift creates a constant turbulence, as on a ship when the ballast shifts from port to starboard. What is needed, instead, is a carefully balanced set of specialized programs across institutional lines to serve a community, a state, or perhaps a broad region.

The purpose of developing interinstitutional awareness is to conserve resources and, in the broadest perspective, to establish balanced and comprehensive training programs which are carefully attuned to the needs of children. An implication of this idea is that the staff at each training center will be continually aware of the limits of its own training efforts and will refer trainees to other centers that offer different specializations. This kind of interinstitutional cooperation is essential in low-incidence areas where only a few training centers of high repute are likely to exist.

In the DELPHI survey, the development among institutions of higher education of "consortiums within states and regions for purposes of planning special education training programs" was rated as only "somewhat likely" but "highly desirable" in the next decade. The item (#29) showed a high D > L discrepancy, that is, the event was judged to be more desirable than likely, an attitude that poses a distinct challenge to college personnel.

2.3.3 Examples

Positive: The state department of education publishes a report and convenes periodic meetings of college and university representatives to review the resources and productivity of each training program, as a means of encouraging interinstitutional awareness and planning.

A college that does not offer specialized preparation in some area helps to recruit and refer promising students to centers with strong programs in those areas.

The colleges and regional service centers of a state regularly share tentative plans for summer training programs one year in advance, so that the programs will complement and not duplicate one another.

A university decides to close a training program relating to hearing impaired children because a nearby institution has a strong program that supplies all needs in the area.

Negative: A college organizes the third state program for the preparation of teachers of the visually handicapped without reference to established programs.

Teachers of the trainable retarded, after neglect for years, receive invitations to two nearby college summer training programs for the same month.

A student interested in teaching the blind is recruited instead to another field because the local college offers it.

Three training centers in the same area are simultaneously developing packaged training modules on behavior modification procedures without fully sharing their plans.

2.3.4 Guidelines

1 (1) Training centers for special education personnel should make appropriate use of instructional resources from external sources in order to assure adequate inputs and alternatives in preparation programs. They should also contribute their best resources in sharing system for use by others.

2 (2) Preparation centers for special education personnel should make appropriate use of all relevant instructional resources, including those from external sources, in order to assure adequate inputs and alternatives in preparation programs. They should also share their best resources with others.

3

2.3.4 Rationale

A quite different aspect of the resource analysis and planning problem concerns the availability and use of all relevant teaching modules and materials including those from "other" centers. The major point of interest in this guideline is the sharing of training materials among preparation centers. Fortunately, interest is burgeoning among training centers to share their ideas and materials. The publication of a Sourcebook[14] on the development of teacher training materials, a cooperative effort by the Division on Teacher Education of CEC, the Research and Development Center on Special Education Teacher Education at the University of Indiana, and the Leadership Training Institute/Special Education at the University of Minnesota, perhaps signals this new spirit and fact of life. DELPHI survey results confirm the desirability of such developments.

The numbers of carefully developed and evaluated materials which training centers can obtain and use to enhance the quality of their efforts are increasing. It is, perhaps, too much to expect that the exportable modules will be totally self-instructional; indeed, there is some evidence that most trainees do not like to be left totally on their own in complex learning tasks. But the expanding supply of materials can surely be used by instructors in ways that will extend their resourcefulness and the quality of their instruction. Use of materials from other centers helps to compensate for what might otherwise be weaknesses or gaps in immediate training resources; they also help to create alternative approaches for choices by trainees.

If there is to be widespread sharing of training modules, it is essential that each center make available what resources it can to increase the total fund of training materials in the field. To do so requires efforts beyond those for strictly local purposes; for example, producing a 16mm film rather than a half-inch videotape, or securing copyright clearances and reproducing excerpts of printed materials rather than simply using the local library.

---

[14] Thiagarajan, S., Semmel, M., & Semmel, D. Instructional development for training teachers of exceptional children: A sourcebook. Reston, VA.: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1974.

2.3.4 Rationale (cont.)

To secure strong commitments to this kind of developmental work, it will be important that the reward patterns for trainers be adjusted accordingly. Many college professors now carry their research projects through dissemination phases because colleges place high value upon research reports which have been "juried" by peers and published by reputable journals. A comparable system can and should be established to enhance the importance of creative and shared work in the training domain. Indeed, it appears that the Teacher Education Division of CEC is launching a program to fill this void.

Respondents in the DELPHI survey gave an extremely high rating on the "desirability" (mean, 6.5) of interinstitutional sharing of instructional materials for teacher education and other training purposes; they did not consider it nearly so likely that colleges would, in fact, cooperate in this way (mean on "likelihood," 5.0). Here again is a very high D > L discrepancy that calls for attention in college programs and other training centers.

2.3.4 Examples

Positive: A local school system catalogues and makes available to teachers all known special education teacher training modules.

After careful evaluation, a college staff member incorporates protocol and training materials from other centers into his course.

The Teacher Education Division of CEC launches a new system to provide for the sharing of instructional materials among teacher education centers; it includes a central cataloguing service.

A trainer makes a special effort to convert his videotape training materials to high quality 16mm film and announces their availability to other centers.

Students are given credit for individually working through an extensive series of modules purchased from another university.

A training center uses a module on genetics from an external source which they would not have been able to produce locally.

Negative: A professor teaches a course on language development in which he has marginal qualifications; he has no awareness of the carefully developed training materials available on the subject.

A training center builds a file of videotapes of excellent quality but never clears them with the subjects shown on the tapes and, thus, cannot share them.

A college fails to set aside a budget for building a library of instructional materials in teacher education.

---

2. Preparation
2.3 Resource Analysis

2.3.5 Guidelines

1 (1) Institutions that undertake the preparation of leadership personnel, such as program administrators, teacher educators, and researchers, should possess unusually strong academic programs in broad areas so that all relevant scholarly resources can be used in the development of special education.

2 (2) Centers that undertake the preparation of special education leadership personnel should offer very strong special education programs plus strong academic programs in broad areas so that all relevant scholarly resources can be used in their development.

3 (3-A) Institutions that undertake the preparation of leadership personnel, such as program administrators, teacher educators, and researcher should possess strong academic programs and/or locally available resources in diverse areas so that all relevant resources can be used in the development of special education.

4

2. Preparation
2.3 Resource Analysis

2.3.5 Rationale

This guideline refers, in the main, to advanced graduate programs which offer preservice preparation for administrators, teacher educators, and researchers and to all varieties of centers which may offer continuing education for such leadership personnel. It suggests that only centers which offer advanced preparation in a variety of related fields should undertake to prepare leaders in the special education field. Leadership preparation centers should possess and use unusually rich scholarly resources in related basic disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, political science, linguistics), and in related professions (school and public administration, medicine, law) to maximize the capabilities of the trainees. Departments undertaking such training should also have ongoing programs of research, development and evaluation that offer opportunities for the involvement of leadership trainees.

2.3.5 Examples

Positive: As part of their preparation, leadership trainees are rotated through a minimum of three development and dissemination programs for the experience.

A joint seminar is offered by a law school and a department of special education on due process and right to education issues.

Leadership trainees in special education participate in a behavioral genetics laboratory which is managed cooperatively by the departments of psychology and genetics.

Through initiatives taken by the state department of education, scholars from several states are assembled to help support instruction in a special institute for administrators.

Negative: Leadership trainees in special education administration simply select courses that meet the minimum standards of the state department of education.

A department offers an advanced program for potential leaders which consists almost totally of professional content; little orientation to relevant disciplines is provided.

Leadership trainees are given little help in evaluating research and in creative scholarly approaches to problem definition and solution.

---

2. Preparation
2.4 Curriculum and Methods

2.4.1 Guidelines

1	(1)	Preparation programs for special education personnel should proceed from explicit and public statements of measurable goals and objectives.
2	(2)	Preparation programs for special education personnel should be constructed on the basis of explicit and public statements of measurable goals and objectives.
3	(2)	It is desirable that preparation programs for special education personnel proceed from stated, measurable, goals and objectives.
4		

2.4 Curriculum and Methods

Assuming that decisions have been made about program areas to be established in accord with the preceding sections 2.2 and 2.3, processes for the detailed specification of each program can be considered. In this section, therefore, the focus is on the subsequent and central problems of curriculum and methods of instruction in the selected program areas.

2.4.1 Rationale

When goals are explicit and public they enable trainees and potential trainees, employers, and the general public to know the expected outcomes of instruction. When objectives are made sufficiently explicit, the criteria by which outcomes can be evaluated also tend to become clear.

It is not intended that statements should refer to mere performance to the neglect of knowledges, appreciation, and values. Objectives undoubtedly should include theoretical content in addition to procedural abilities. This guideline proposes that preparation centers make sensible efforts to delineate program goals objectively, make them public, and be accountable for their achievement. It is assumed that the process of clarifying goals and objectives, when approached seriously, pays off well in improved instruction.

2.4.1 Examples

Positive: A college department "spells out" the general and detailed objectives of its training programs in competency terms and relates them to alternative courses, instructional modules, and independent study strategies.

A faculty in a preparation program carefully delineates objectives to be achieved in didactic and practicum aspects of the program.

A state department of teacher certification accepts from training centers the delineations of programs in terms of objectives instead of by course titles.

Negative: The college curriculum committee approves a new course which is outlined only by topics, rather than by objectives.

Trainers work on the details of objectives for courses, but the results are unavailable to students except by extraordinary appeal to individual professors.

A training center faculty refuses to consider reorganizing their courses around objectives because they fear change.

2.4.2 Guidelines

1	(1)	Training centers must be prepared to justify the goals, objectives, and instructional procedures used in preparation programs.
2	(2)	Preparation centers should be prepared to justify the goals, objectives, and instructional procedures used in preparation programs.
3	(3-A)	Preparation centers should be prepared to justify the goals, objectives, and instructional procedures used in preparation programs to the consumer of the services.
4	(3-A)	Preparation centers must be prepared to justify the goals, objectives and instructional procedures used in preparation programs and to modify them in the light of accumulating research and other evidence. These goals should reflect the broader goals of the framework of the training center and broader institutions in which they must exist. Such goals and objects should include behavioral, cognitive and affective domains.
5		

2.4.2 Rationale

The analyses of the training programs and the decision-making processes relating to goals, objectives, and training procedures require systematic and continuing effort. There are numerous ways in which training sequences can be given substance and sequence. Experience, research, creativity, and as much wisdom as can be mustered are the requisites merely to structure the alternatives in general terms. Subsequent problems include task analysis, evaluation, and implementation. Fortunately, a variety of models are now available to help in organizing systems for specifying programs.[15]

By deciding upon the general areas in which to develop programs and then proceeding to detail the specifications of the programs, training centers meet the greatest of their challenges. Some observers feel that when objectives are fully clarified and made explicit, at least half the educational job has been completed.

It is not enough, of course, just to "set" objectives for a training program; they must also be justified individually and in toto. Trainers face the problem of showing that the competencies acquired by students in their programs are validated by the improved services which can be provided for exceptional children. Evidence of program validity is relevant to, among others, students, those who fund the activities, accrediting agencies, and, ultimately, the exceptional children in whose service the program is conducted.

The validation of objectives is partly a research problem, but sometimes no more than concensus by leading practitioners will be possible. In some measure, each trainee demonstrates the validity of the program in which he was prepared. Thus follow-up data are also relevant to justification process. In any case, the justification of training program elements and structures is a proper challenge and test for trainers.

---

[15] For example, see the model developed by Marvin Alkin and his associates at the Center for the Study of Evaluation at UCLA; the CIPP model developed by Daniel Stufflebeam at Western Michigan University; or the discrepancy model of Malcolm Provus at the University of Virginia.

2.4.2 Examples

Positive: A local educational agency adopts the UCLA evaluation model as an approach to program specification and evaluation.

A community advisory board joins with teachers in advising a core staff on setting designs for continuing education in a local educational agency.

Systematic procedures for task analysis are applied in planning the teacher education program.

The staff of a training center uses recent graduates as a panel to help rate the importance of various training objectives.

Negative: Professors take two days off to convert courses to a competency/objectives format but they make no fundamental changes in the orientation of the training operation.

A state certification officer insists on communicating with colleges in terms of traditional courses rather than objectives and competencies.

Objectives and procedures in teacher education are justified on the simple basis of "concensus doctorum," involving only the local institution.

2.4.3 Guidelines

1 (1) Agencies conducting training programs should encourage and guide trainees who wish to individualize their studies outside or beyond the usual patterns of instruction, as long as the required competencies are achieved.

2 (2) Agencies conducting preparation programs should encourage and counsel trainees who wish to individualize their studies outside or beyond the usual patterns of instruction, as long as the required competencies are achieved.

3

2.4.3 Rationale

When training centers have specified their goals/objectives and organized their resources for instruction, they may find that some trainees would prefer to pursue the objectives by highly personalized routes. It may be the case, for example, that some trainees can successfully employ independent readings whereas most others need lectures and films in addition to readings in order to attain certain knowledges. Alternatively, another student may prefer attending some specialized institution to learn a specific skill rather than taking the on-campus course on the same topic.

It is suggested here that trainees be allowed and encouraged to pursue reasonable, individualized study plans after negotiations with trainers providing the students are willing to meet rigorous competency tests in whatever domains are involved. To operate such an individualized system is probably quite expensive in terms of planning time and the demands placed upon a center's assessment system. If the competencies of trainees are not checked very carefully the whole system can be a disastrous concession to form without substance. A program of this kind deserves the closest scrutiny, but equally, it deserves fair trial and special support in developmental phases.

DELPHI respondents were quite sympathetic to the idea of permitting students to negotiate individual study plans although the "likelihood" rating (4.1; "somewhat likely") was lower than the "desirability" rating (5.5: "desirable"). The sizable D > L discrepancy indicates that the subject is one in which hope is likely to exceed reality for some time.

2.4.3 Examples

Positive: A student is encouraged in his desire to attend a series of special conferences on creativity as an alternative to the course on "the gifted."

A teacher spends the summer as a participant instructor in an institution that has an exemplary behavior modification program, instead of taking the local course.

The college department of special education funds a competency laboratory where students may be examined for knowledges and skills and be given credits without taking courses.

A professor encourages and assists a student who prefers to undertake "independent study," rather than to attend his course.

Negative: A trainee is required to sit through the braille course, despite her 20-year experience in using braille.

A student claims competencies on the basis of having participated in "workshops" but resists the rigorous assessment of the competencies.

A college refuses to give credit by examination.

2.4.4 Guidelines

1 (1) Preparation programs for special education personnel should be conducted by appropriate varied, and individualized methods of instruction and be evaluated systematically to provide a model of excellence for trainees.

2 (2) Preparation Programs for special education personnel should be conducted by appropriate, varied, and individualized methods of instruction and be evaluated systematically in order to provide trainees with models of excellence.

3 (2) In order to provide a model of excellence for trainees, preparation programs for special education personnel should be conducted by personnel using appropriate, varied, and individualized methods of instruction which are systematically evaluated.

4

2.4.4 Rationale

Training programs need to be concerned with and earn their own credibility by demonstrating the very best of procedures for instruction. At the least, careful attention to the development and evaluation of alternative procedures and individualized methods of organizing instruction for trainees will be involved.

A genuine sense of inquiry is communicated to trainees when the programs in which they participate are made the objects of careful evaluation and continuing development. It is highly desirable that such a spirit of inquiry about instruction be widely diffused among both trainers and trainees. There is probably no better way to achieve this goal than to practice it regularly and systematically.

2.4.4 Examples

Positive: The training center presents a variety of alternative routes which may be used by trainees in their pursuit of each training objective.

The training center specifies prerequisites for all training components and administers criterion-referenced tests on them to all enrollees.

Trainees in a preparation program regularly participate in evaluations of the processes of instruction in which they participate.

Negative: Instruction is uniformly by lecture, textbook, and norm-referenced examinations.

Exams come only after the fact, rather than as part of the instructional process.

Programs are evaluated but the results are not disseminated.

2.4.4.1 Guidelines

1 (1) Centers that conduct both training and research programs in special education should seek positive interaction effects among such programs.

2 (2) Suggest - renumber: 2.4.5

3

2.4.4.1 (2.4.5) Rationale

When preparation centers also conduct programs of research and development, opportunities exist to achieve mutual program enhancement through interactions of research and training activities. For example, an instructor who both teaches about and develops curriculums is in an excellent position to improve the experiences of special education trainees by involving them in "R & D" projects. Indeed, the values of such interaction are so obvious and so great that it might be argued that many university departments of special education should consider engaging in programs only in those areas in which research and training activities show significant interaction.

2.4.4.1 (2.4.5) Examples

Positive: Trainees in language courses are rotated through a research project on language.

Students in curriculum development are invited to participate regularly in meetings of a staff working on a new curriculum for profoundly handicapped children.

Researchers in a department of special education regularly conduct colloquiums for students preparing for professional positions.

Negative: A department does research on the deaf but trains teachers of "EMR" in total disjunction from research.

A training center houses an "R & D" center but trainers and their students are not involved in or aware of the "R & D" activities.

2.4.4.2 Guidelines

(1) Institutions conduct training programs at several levels should seek positive interactions among such programs.

(2) Centers that conduct preparation programs at several levels should effect ongoing interactions among such programs.

2.4.4.2 Rationale

The preceding arguments for the desirability of interactions among training and research programs apply also to interactions among preparation programs at several levels. It is not uncommon, for example, for universities that prepare teacher educators in special education to prepare teachers as well. The two sets of trainees can be enormously useful to one another if suitable arrangements for interactions are made.

2.4.4.2 Examples

Positive: Advanced trainees are given experience in teaching and evaluating modules of instruction for teacher trainees.

Advanced students supervise practicums of teacher candidates and receive critiques from both faculty supervisors and teachers in training.

Aides, teachers, bus drivers and all other special education personnel are included in the fall before-school orientation sessions of a school district.

Advanced trainees assist in evaluating the beginning teacher education sequence.

Teacher trainees and aides-in training are assigned in teams to a practicum site.

Negative: Teachers and teacher aides are given separate orientation and training sessions and so meet each other with little mutual appreciation or trust.

Advanced university students preparing for careers in teacher education are unfamiliar with the university's ongoing teacher education program.

2.5 Practicums

There is a pervasive ferment in education on the ways in which trainees can be given better practicums as part of their preparation programs. A "practicum" is defined here to include all forms of supervised practice for special education trainees. The term is used in reference to both preservice and inservice practicums which are part of training activities.

The DELPHI survey results made it clear that special educators want more of their training to be conducted in the form of practicums in field situations; and they would like to find more "professors" in the field situations working on program improvements.

No one agency is in a perfect position for the arrangement of practicums. Colleges and universities need, but do not control, many placement situations in elementary and secondary schools. From the local school viewpoint, the education of children may be disturbed by the college students and faculty "intruding" in the schools with their own sets of objectives and needs. The situation can be equally difficult in inservice education where, so often, practicum elements are totally lacking or, at least, unsupervised. The set of guidelines that follows is intended to address needs and opportunities for improvement in these important practicum aspects of preparation.

2.5.1 Guidelines

1	(1)	The development and operation of high-quality field stations that offer practicum experiences to personnel being prepared to serve exceptional children is an obligation of all individuals and all institutions in special education.
2	(2)	The development and operation of high-quality practicum experiences for personnel being prepaired to serve exceptional children should involve all individuals and institutions in the field of special education.
3	(2)	All individuals and all institutions in special education should be involved in the collaborative development and operation of quality practicum experiences.
4	(3-B)	It is an obligation of all individuals and all colleges and universities to cooperatively develop and provide high-quality practicum experiences for personnel being prepared to serve exceptional children.
5		

2. Preparation
2.5 Practicums

2.5.1 Rationale

The term "practicum" as used here would include observations in classrooms or schools, practice instruction in micro-teaching centers, supervised parent interviewing in diagnostic clinics, traditional student teaching, supervised practice teaching in college, supervised participation in research and many more forms of carefully designed and supervised work. It is assumed that almost any preparation program will involve a continuum of practicums, starting usually with highly controlled and simplified situations and then moving toward all the complexities of real field situations. This guideline urges the importance of careful development of practicums as aspects of preparation.

The adequate development of practicum problems undoubtedly depends upon the widespread and greater acceptance of responsibility for training by all persons in the field, and upon the straightforward negotiation among all the participants to create situations in which the needs of both the children involved and the personnel being prepared can be met. With but a little attention, creativity, and cooperation, what sometimes looks like a difficult problem of competing needs can be turned into a satisfying joint enterprise, and everyone can be better served.

2. Preparation
2.5 Practicums

2.5.1 Examples

Positive: A college and local school system agree on the joint staffing of a selected set of schools as a "model" for special education and as practicum stations for special education students.

A college and local school system jointly select a master teacher to assist teachers in their classrooms as an adjunctive aspect of a lecture series for the inservice education of teachers.

A school system agrees with a junior college staff on details of a practicum program for paraprofessionals to be conducted in the schools.

A university works out a contract with a nearby state college for giving advanced students a practicum in teacher education at the college.

Negative: A local school system, by quite casual methods, simply presents to the local college a limited list of teachers willing to have "student teachers."

An institution uses paraprofessional trainees as a way of solving a staff shortage, rather than to provide supervision and evaluation in a training mode.

Teachers refuse to accept "student teachers" because of the "interruptions it creates" in the education of children.

2.5.2 Guidelines

1 (1) Practicum experiences should begin early and be a continuous part of preparation programs.

2 (2) Various practicum experiences should begin early and be continuing and integrated parts of preparation programs.

3

2. Preparation
2.5 Practicums

2.5.2 Rationale

The tendency, in arranging practicums, has been to think and act as if they needed to be clearly segmented in certain ways. For example, it is common to provide an early observational sequence for paraprofessional or teacher trainees,with the more complete "student teaching" or its equivalent coming as the final or culminating training element. A quite different and preferred arrangement would place special education trainees continuously in practicums of some form as an aspect of their preparation. In early stages, the procedure may involve mainly observational activities, but then move toward limited intervention experiences such as in micro-teaching or simulated administration, finally culminating in active interventions in school situations of full complexity.

2.5.2 Examples

Positive: Undergraduate students are offered carefully supervised "introductory practicums" in work with exceptional children as a way of exploring interests in special education.

Doctoral candidates negotiate with their advisers on plans for practicum experiences to be included in their programs <u>every semester</u> including the very first!

During their first two years of duty in a local school system, new teachers are enrolled in a practicum/seminar and given related assistance by a helping teacher.

Positive: Doctoral candidates do their first research for their dissertation.

Paraprofessional trainees meet handicapped children in the schools only in their last semester.

Teacher candidates do their first special teaching when they enroll for "student teaching" in their last semester on a campus.

2.5.3 Guidelines

1	(1)	It is desirable that practicums for special education trainees be conducted in situations where the quality of supervision is very high; quality supervision supercedes all other considerations in arranging practicums.
2	(2)	Practicums for special education trainees should be conducted in situations where the quality of models and supervision is very high.
3	(3-C)	Preparation programs which entail practicums in school or agency situations should provide on-site supervision of highest quality by both training center and agency personnel.
4	(3-C)	Practicums for special education trainees should be conducted in situations where the quality of supervision is a major consideration in selecting practicum sites.

2.5.3 Rationale

There is an understandable and valid tendency to seek student practicum stations that represent the particular kinds of situations, such as special classes, local administrative posts, research centers, or college teaching situations, in which the students are likely to be employed at a later time. However, more important than having trainees in exactly the "right" kind of situation is the matter of arranging for trainees to work in appropriate situations with persons who are thoughtful, creative, and effective. It is almost certainly more important, for example, that administrative trainees should work under the supervision of strong and foresightful leaders than that they be in the "right kind of setting" of any kind. Similarly, for teachers, paraprofessionals, researchers, and others, a primary concern in arranging practicums should be the quality of the persons from whom they receive orientation and supervision.

When considering university programs which entail practicums in school or agency situations, it is important that on-site supervision of highest quality be provided by both university and agency personnel.

If university personnel are themselves deeply involved in field work and can offer practicums to trainees as a joint enterprise, the situation is optimal for all concerned. Perhaps this kind of arrangement works out most easily and frequently in preparation programs for researchers. Graduate students preparing for research careers usually have convenient laboratories close at hand in the work of their professor-advisers. It is argued here that the same kind of joint teacher-student "hands on" experience can be created for trainees preparing for other roles as well.

2. Preparation
2.5 Practicums

2.5.3 Examples

Positive: Administrative trainees oriented to local school posts are permitted to do parts of their practicums in a welfare office and citizens' free law clinic which have extremely favorable reputations for leadership.

A professor spends half his time working in an elementary school to install a new model of special education service and he supervises his trainees in that setting.

A "teacher educator" doctoral candidate does a carefully supervised practicum in the Division on Preparation of Personnel of the USOE's Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

A teacher-in-training is permitted to do "student teaching" with an outstanding local private tutor.

New teacher aides are employed for an initial period in a special center which provides exceptionally careful supervision of their work with children.

Negative: All teacher candidates do student teaching in the nearby "school for the blind," where only routine attention to quality of supervision is given.

Administrative trainees are routinely assigned for three months experience in the offices of the local special education administrator because of its convenience.

The inservice training program in a local district is conducted entirely by "outside" lecturers who have no knowledge of or part in operations of the local schools and who thus fail to "connect" adequately to the realities of the local situation.

2.6 Evaluation

In recent years, agencies that sought federal funds for training programs have been confronted by the insistent demand that their proposals include a substantial component of evaluation. This demand is a sign of the rising general concern for the validation and documentation of claims for resources. But evaluation need not and should not be thought of simply in the context of justifying claims for support; it has a broader significance as reflected in the guidelines which follow.

2.6.1 Guideline

1 (1) Preparation programs for special education personnel should be evaluated systematically and continuously on both processes and products of instruction, and on both effectiveness and validity.

2 Preparation programs for special education personnel should be evaluated systematically and continuously relative to established institutional objectives on both processes and products of instruction, and on both effectiveness and validity.

3 (3-A) Preparation programs for special education personnel should be evaluated systematically and continuously on both processes and products of instruction, and on both effectiveness and validity "Such evaluation should involve representatives of all constituencies affected by the training program, including students within the program.

4 (3-A) Preparation programs should provide for systematic and continuous evaluation. "Such evaluation should involve representatives of all constituencies affected by the training program.

5

2.6.1 Rationale

Leading theoreticians on evaluation stress that evaluation should be a process in which the collection and analysis of information improves decision making; the decisions which must be made are of many kinds. Two of the common distinctions are between formative and summative evaluation, or, to use a roughly corresponding set of terms, between process and product evaluation. In process evaluation, attention is given to the decisions which might be made about the processes or procedures used in training; and by product or summative evaluation, one refers to the final outcome or the competencies of the finished trainee in the present context. It is important that training centers engage in both process and product evaluation as a basis for improving programs and making decisions on the value of continuing them.

Another distinction which may be useful, and which was implied in earlier discussions, is between the evaluation of effectiveness and of validity. Effectiveness evaluation refers to whether the training program actually succeeds in creating the competencies it set out as objectives for trainees. It is not unknown for training centers to let their rhetoric about objectives and competencies far exceed the realities of their operation, a failing which needs to be assessed.

Validity evaluation refers to the extent to which programs produce results at the ultimate level--the achievements or development of exceptional children.

The total process of evaluation is assisted enormously, of course, if the objectives of training have been made clear and translated into criteria by which tests of attainment can be applied.

Readers are reminded of a point made much earlier in this chapter (see 2.1, General Considerations): representatives of all persons affected by preparation programs should be involved in planning the preparation. This suggestion holds with particular force in evaluation activities. It is assumed, for example, that trainees should always be involved systematically in the evaluation of preparation programs and that the results of such evaluations should be reviewed by all persons involved in the program or affected by it.

2. Preparation
2.6 Evaluation

2.6.1 Examples

Positive: Teacher trainees are checked on more than the ability to perform the teaching of a lesson; charts on their effectiveness, as shown in their results with children, are kept and reviewed as well.

Trainers systematically review research to assess the likely validity of various materials and methods of instruction.

Graduates of training programs are systematically queried for suggestions on needed changes in programs.

A broad team of community representatives joins with a faculty group to evaluate program results.

A detailed study is made to ascertain whether students actually read the materials which are "assigned" to them.

Negative: Students are penalized for criticizing their instructional programs.

Trainees are asked to rate their teachers but not the importance and relevance of the content in a program.

Trainees are given assignments but no systematic means is provided to check on whether the trainees actually follow through on assignments.

2.6.2 Guideline

1	(1)	Preparation centers should assess and document the competencies of their trainees.
2	(2)	Preparation centers should assess and document the competencies of their trainees.
3	(3-C)	(Combine with 2.6.1) Part of the evaluation should be the assessment and documentation of competencies of trainees.
4		

2.6.2 Rationale

In addition to its programmatic evaluations, a training center should focus on the assessment of each trainee at suitable points; it is of special importance at the termination of a training sequence to have a thorough documentation of each trainee's competencies for purposes of communication with certifying and employing agencies. It is hoped that preparation centers will also operate well-designed entry assessment programs as one approach to the individualized planning of instruction; assessments should also be a recurring aspect of teaching.

An especially critical aspect of training assessment is the establishment of a reliable system to document each trainee's knowledges and skills. It is not entirely settled that everything that comes under the "PBTE"[16] rubric will be implemented in teacher education, but it is quite clear that many people--including trainers, certification officers, and school personnel officers--are shifting to a competency unit, rather than a course credit unit for communication purposes. Thus, it seems necessary to establish documents on trainees that reflect competencies; these, in turn, presumably, are in accord with the training objectives.

It may not always be necessary to set up separate competency evaluation agencies outside of training units, assuming that the training units restructure their operations around competency objectives and evaluations. Well-documented course achievements can provide records on competencies.

This matter of documenting competencies is a new challenge in many centers. Successful implementation will require the strong commitment of resources and the establishment of clear responsibility and accountability for the sytem's operation.

It is assumed that trainees should be fully aware of the status of their competencies as recorded in agency files. Counseling with students concerning their competencies and assisting them in assessing and documenting their own competencies will require careful attention.

---

[16] Performance (or Competency) Based Teacher Education.

2.6.2 Examples

Positive: The training center operates a system whereby the competencies of trainees at the time of entrance are specified and used in individual program planning.

In addition to "grades," instructors report to a recording office on the competencies attained by each student which reach the required criterion levels.

The director of inservice education administers a system by which competencies established during inservice education programs are entered into the permanent file of each school employee.

Negative: Records kept on students reflect mainly course titles and grades.

Placement files contain only observations on the general intellectual and personality attributes, plus general ratings on competency of students completing each program.

2.7.1 Guideline

1 (1) Persons who conduct preparation programs for special education personnel should demonstrate the scholarly mastery of relevant domains of knowledge, posses a very high degree of professional skill and participate regularly in professional renewal activities.

2 Persons who conduct preparation programs for special education personnel should reflect a very high degree of professional and interpersonal skills, demonstrate proficiencies in the relevant domains of knowledge, and participate regularly in professional renewal activities.

3 (2) Persons who conduct preparation programs for special education personnel should demonstrate competencies in their area(s) of specialization and be able to convey those competencies to trainees. They should participate regularly in professional renewal activities which should include working with exceptional children.

4 (3-A) Persons who conduct preparation programs for special education personnel should demonstrate the mastery of relevant domains of knowledge, possess a very high degree of professional skill, participate regularly in professional renewal activities, and be skilled in the demonstration of these competencies.

5 (3-B) Persons who conduct preparation programs for special education personnel should demonstrate very high degree of professional skill and participate regularly in professional renewal activities.

6

2.7.1 Rationale

The influence of personnel who conduct preparation programs for the new generation of teachers, leaders, and staff for special education programs can be justified only by high competencies and dedication. The teachers of teachers in the professional aspects of programs ought to be truly outstanding exemplars of the profession. They should have been selected for their outstanding performances, talents, and preparations - well above the usual. That they have advanced graduate degrees is less important than a solid mastery of relevant scholarly and professional substance and the skills to introduce trainees to processes by which they can effectively serve exceptional children.

One of the oddities of special education, and of many other fields, is that the teachers of teachers and other leadership personnel are often poorly served themselves regarding continuing development. Virtually no effective support system is made available to the college professor or the inservice training director; they have not themselves created a strong mutual help system. Sabbatical leaves that might serve to free some of them for important renewal activities are by-passed too often for the continued advising and teaching of others.

This neglect of renewal by leaders does not go unnoticed, especially by school leaders of progressive spirit, and the situation badly needs remediation. Aggressive, administrative behavior to enforce leaves for study and lessen distracting commitments by professors and other trainers will help; so will strengthened organizations, such as the Division on Teacher Education of CEC, which now gives promise as a potentially strong mutual help system for trainers.

2.7.1 Examples

Positive: A college department of special education, in cooperation with local public schools, appoints "master teachers" who have extraordinary skill in teaching and who will supervise college special education trainees in the schools.

The inservice education director uses talented people from whatever source to conduct training sessions, the criterion being simply the degree ofsuccess in achieving desired training outcomes.

Teacher education is offered by a team of people including some who do and others who do not have advanced degrees, but all of whom have demonstrated outstanding competencies in teacher education.

Professors regularly review and accept accountability for their plans for self-renewal with department administrators.

Negative: The college hires a "methods" instructor simply on the basis of a doctorate and two years experience in the desired "category."

The methods courses for new teachers are taught by instructors who can successfully demonstrate their own methods and materials, but who are not knowledgeable about alternative approaches.

The trainer mainly attends conventions and conferences for their social events.

2.7.2 Guideline

1	(1)	Training centers for special education personnel should carefully specify and document the duties of trainers; such "expectation" statements should be negotiated and fully understood by trainers and relevant administrators.
2	(2)	Preparation centers for special education personnel should carefully specify and document the duties of trainers; the statements of duties should be negotiated by trainers and relevant administrators and should represent mutual understandings.
3	(2)	All personnel engaged in teacher preparation should be provided with specific descriptions of their duties and obligations and these contingencies should be fully understood by all parties involved.

2.7.2 Rationale

Teacher trainers and others who conduct preparation programs for special education personnel very frequently have one-of-a-kind jobs in their institutions. Sometimes their duties are unclear, which is an immediate problem and can also escalate into a serious personnel problem and programmatic failure. Such conditions do not provide a climate for healthy development and performance.

It is proposed that strong efforts be made to define the duties of all trainers in explicit terms; such an effort can clarify the bases on which performances are evaluated. Unless the duties of trainers are specified, it is also difficult to assure adherence to the plans developed by the training center. Clearly, the trainers themselves need to be involved very heavily in shaping plans for their activities. Once negotiated, the "expectation" statements become the basis on which performance may be documented and evaluation accomplished.

It is not common, at this time, for the positions and expected performances of college professors and their counterparts in other agencies to be described in a detailed, public fashion. This guideline proposes that it would be a good and useful step to move strongly in that direction. This guideline proposes that those who would lead the field need to do so in part by modeling the kind of accountability held for other practitioners in the field.

2.7.2 Examples

Positive: A professor specifies and clears with his administrative officer the amount of teaching, research time, and other organizational activities he will undertake for the year.

A plan is instituted whereby each"extra"duty taken on by trainers is reported, reviewed, and approved, thus conserving their main energies and time for teaching.

The development of a new teaching module is considered to be a specific part-time commitment for a year for one trainer and is planned as such.

Negative: The professor serves on an uncontrolled number of graduate student committees.

The number of advisees for each professor is unplanned and uncontrolled.

Instructors are simply told what they will teach, with no negotiation process.

The instructor specifies quite casually what he/she will teach without careful assessment of needs and resources in a broader framework.

---

2. Preparation
2.7 Personnel

2.7.3 Guidelines

1 (1) Instructors in training centers for the preparation of special education personnel have an obligation to document and evaluate their own performances as a basis for the improvement of instruction and review and evaluation by their employing institutions. Formal evaluations of instruction by trainees should always be a part of such evaluation and documentation.

2 (2) Instructors in centers for the preparation of special education personnel have an obligation to evaluate and document their own performances. These serve as a basis for the improvement of instruction as well as a basis for review and evaluation by their employing institutions. Formal evaluations of instruction by students should always be a part of such evaluation and documentation.

3 (2) Instructors in training centers for the preparation of special education personnel have an obligation to document and evaluate their own performances; to be reviewed and evaluated by their peers; and to conduct formal evaluations of instruction by trainees.

4

2.7.3 Rationale

The collateral imperative for the preceding guideline (2.7.2) on the clarification of expectations for trainer performance, is that the actual performance of trainers also be documented and evaluated regularly. It is hoped that the statements of expectation will be so clear as to provide criteria by which performance is judged. Then the problem is to test the performance against the criteria.

The first responsibility for the documentation of performance rests with the trainer himself. He should assemble, with guidance from his administrative officer, whatever documents are available or can be created to demonstrate the quality and effects of his performances. Such documents might include course plans and outlines, resource lists, instructional materials produced, results of competency exams and student evaluations, reprints of articles, and so forth.

Administrative officers are also in the position to provide evidence of performance quality and to organize careful reviews by peers of the trainer's performance, which can be used as part of the basis on which rewards are provided; for example, salary, recognition, and promotion.

It is assumed that students will always be involved in the evaluation of instruction and that the results of such evaluation will be reviewed at times of decisions on promotions, salary increases, and other forms of reward and recognition for trainers.

In a sense, systems by which the work of the trainer is carefully described as an "expectation" and his performance is documented and evaluated, are equivalent to the standards set for teachers for certification, tenure promotion, and recertification decisions.

2.7.3 Examples

Positive: Each instructor collects data from all students at the end of each training sequence; results are used to plan improvements in the program and in human performance and become part of the instructor's performance file.

Each trainer assembles a file of documents reflecting his classroom and self-renewal activities.

Peer reviews and critiques are an annual affair for each trainer, with his expectation and performance files up for review.

Negative: The work of trainers is given only perfunctory reviews.

No specific job definitions or expectation statements exist for professional positions.

Section 3 CERTIFICATION

The process of certification is a power held by the individual state governments. As might be expected there is considerable variation among the states as to the requirements for certification and the way in which the process is administered. In addition, there is considerable variation among the states regarding inter-state reciprocity arrangements. The guidelines in this section seek to suggest paths in which the process of certification can move to meet the needs of today's education.

Results of the DELPHI survey which was undertaken as part of the PS & G project may be of interest here as they pertain to the subject of certification. Some serious criticisms of certification and credentialing practices have been raised among educators, centering mainly on two aspects; that credentialing may have been overstressed generally in our society and, secondly, that often the processes of credentialing become the self-serving instruments of professional incumbents or ot training institutions.

The DELPHI results nevertheless underlined the importance of certification processes; for example, respondents rejected the notion that individuals could be relied upon "without sanction by any group" to take only jobs for which they were well qualified. The survey respondents also gave mainly negative responses to the notion that individuals could be relied upon to "document their own competencies thus permitting simplification" of state certification processes. Special educators apparently do not wish to see the certification processes eroded.

Several items on the DELPHI survey explored the possibility that the numbers of different kinds of special education certificates might be different in the future. Results suggest that the trend over the next decade will be to reduce the number of different catagories of certification. State directors and "leaders" of special education estimated that by 1983 only four or five different kinds of certificates would be offered in special education whereas the average number in the several states is now seven or eight.

3.1 Guideline

1 (1) The newly emerging roles for special education teachers (consulting teachers or resource room teachers) have suggested a variety of philosophies regarding certification requirements.

2 (3-A) The newly emerging, expanding and changing roles for special education personnel indicate the need for flexibility regarding certification.

3

3. Certification
3.1 Criteria

3.1.1 Guideline

1	(1)	Special education certification in most areas should be based on prior certification and experience in regular classrooms.
2	(2)	Special education certification in most areas should be based on prior experience with normal children.
3	(3-B)	Special education certification in most areas should be based on some prior experience with handicapped children.
4	(3-A)	Special education certification in most areas should be based upon a thorough special education preparation with additional emphasis on regular education curriculum but not full regular certification. Familiarity with regular education may be obtained through course-work, practical and other experiences.
5	(3-D)	Special education certification should be based on direct training for the specific areas or areas of exceptionality.
6	(3-D)	Special education certification should be based on demonstrated competencies.
7		

3.1.2 Guideline

1	(1)	Special education certification may be more valuable when based on a double major concept, such as special education and elementary education.
2	(3-A)	Special education certification should encourage the combining of fields of specialization to create new and varied patterns of training.
3	(3-D)	Special education certification should be based on demonstrated competencies in methodology and content appropriate for individuals being served.
4		

3.1.3 Guideline

1	(1)	Certification for special education should be considered to be largely a graduate level program.
2	(3-A)	Full certification for special education should be considered to be largely a graduate level program assuming that the undergraduate program is generalized.
3	(3-D)	Certification for special education should be based on a level of preparation that is appropriate for the specific competencies required by the position in question.
4	(3-D)	Certification for special education should be considered a competency based program. Continuing preparation at the graduate level may be necessary for gaining additional depth and/or breadth appropriate to the special educator's role.
5	(3-D)	Certification for special education personnel should allow for differentiated staffing at varying entry levels commensurate with the trainee's occupational objectives.
6	(3-D)	Restatement: Certification for special education administrators and supervisors should be considered a graduate level program.
7		

3.2 Guideline

1

Certification in the field of special education should be for a limited period of time with periodic renewal required.

2 (3-A)

Certification for all persons in the field of special education should be for a limited period with periodic renewal required. Renewal should be a process mutually agreed upon by all personnel involved.

3

3.2 Rationale

One of the particular issues raised in the DELPHI survey concerned the periodic renewal of certificates for all special education personnel. The argument, of course, is that the public good requires recurrent testimony concerning the credibility of persons in professional roles rather than to give "life-long" tenure at the time of entry. The respondents on the DELPHI survey gave a me an rating at the "highly desirable" level on the notion of periodic renewal, but there was very great variability among individual responses. Among the various subgroups of respondents it is noteworthy that the State Directors of Teacher Certification were more optimistic than almost all others that periodic renewal procedures would actually be installed - indeed, as they already are in some states. Teacher subgroups, those most likely to face limited-period certification, tended to rate the "desirability" of this policy relatively lower than others. Nevertheless, the limited-period certification policy is advocated here as a professional responsibility to the public.

3.2 Examples

Positive:

Teachers are required to renew their special education certificates every five years, on the basis of demonstrated teaching effectiveness.

Professors are required to renegotiate their positions in preparation centers at least once every five years on the basis of demonstrated competitiveness and trainee competitiveness.

Administrators are appointed to their special education posts in the LEA for five year terms, renewable only on the basis of evidence of outstanding performance.

Negative:

Teachers seek and obtain immediate life tenure as certified teachers at the point of entry to teaching.

Administrators are certified for life.

3.3 Guideline

1	(1)	Certification in special education should move in the direction of non-categorical certification rather than toward increased specialization.
2	(3-D)	Certification in special education should provide for non-categorical certification as an alternative, when appropriate. Caution must be exercised to provide for the competencies needed for the total range of exceptional children (mild to severe, sensorially handicapped, etc.)
3		

3.4 Guideline

1	(1)	Certification both initial and renewed should move in the direction of increased reliance on assessment of competencies and performance.
2	(2)	Certification (both initial and renewal) should be based on competencies and performance.
3		

3.4 Rationale

The problems of measuring or attesting to the competencies of personnel as the bases for certification are manifold. In the past the problems have been avoided simply by certifying all individuals who have completed an approved preparation program. In such a system it is assumed that success in preparation is a good indicator of competency and of the likelihood of adequate performance. Unfortunately such "process" approaches to certification offer only minimal assurances of competency and of adequate performance on-the-job. Thus, there is understandable interest, indeed pressure, for requiring that certifications be based on more solid, product-oriented criteria and evidence. There are different technical problesm in achieving all that one would wish in this domain, but there is some encouraging progress. This guideline is intended as a shulling to the field to make a strong effort to be explicit product-oriented in conducting certification activities.

3.4 Examples

Positive:

Teachers seeking renewal of certificates are asked to present evidence of the results of their teaching efforts.

Administrators seeking renewal of certificates are required to document their leadership in solving major field problems.

Negative:

Renewal of certificates for special education personnel depends only on obtaining "8 semester hours" of college credit every three (3) years.

3.5 Guideline

1	(1)	Primary responsibility for the assessment of the competencies required for certification should be exercised by local boards whose membership consists of persons broadly representative of the teaching profession.
2	(3-B)	Certification should be exercised by state boards whose membership consists of persons exclusively representative of all levels of personnel involved in providing services to exceptional children.
3	(2)	Primary responsibility for the assessment of the competencies required for full and/or renewal certification should be exercised by a council whose membership consists of persons broadly representative of the teaching profession.
4	(3-A)	Primary responsibility for the assessment of the competencies required for certification should be exercised by a local certification board combined with state universities. The certification board membership should consist of persons in the field and other professions.
5	(3-A)	Continuing certification should be based on assessment of competencies as established by broadly based citizen action education groups.
6	(3-D)	Entry level certification should be determined by properly qualified training programs in conjunction with school districts served by it.
7	(3-D)	Primary responsibility for the assessment of the competencies required for certification should be exercised by a national professional body (e.g., CEC), with local input.
8	(3-D)	Primary responsibility for the assessment of the competencies required for certification should be exercised through self-evaluation with assistance from qualified personnel.
9	(3-D)	Certification in special education should be based upon a program description and approval procedure in which individual training institutions state performance criteria and, upon approval from the appropriate state certification agency, assumes responsibility for assessment of performance of program participants in relation to stated competencies.
10		Preparation centers and employing agencies should carry a major role in documenting the specific competencies of special education personnel.
11		

3.5 Rationale (No. 9, 10)

When personnel in the field undertake programs of continuing self-development there is an obvious problem of documenting competencies of individuals in ways which are current and reliable. It is quite clear that State Departments of Education are not able to maintain fully current records of staff qualifications under rapidly changing conditions. Indeed, the DELPHI scoring results suggest that individuals might expect to be certified by State Officers in somewhat more general ways in the future than is now the case in most states. This means that the more detailed accounts of competencies will need to be developed elsewhere. Individuals can, of course, develop individual resume's or 'dossiers' which they believe reflect their competencies, but there is an institutional responsibility to further validate or document individual competency profiles.

This guideline urges the importance of developing current, reliable and valid accounts of competency as part of college services and of employing institutions. It will be expensive, but important, to do this job well.

3.5 Examples

Positive: The LEA provides well documented official accounts of the competencies of its personnel which may be used in 'outside' as well as 'inside' negotiations.

Negative: The LEA develops only 'local-use' anecdotal records and general ratings of performance on personnel.

3.6 Guidelines

1 Certification agencies should actively seek ways to simplify and regularize the interstate transfer of special education credentials.

2 Certification agencies should seek to simplify and regularize the interstate transfer of special education teaching credentials.

3.6 Rationale

There is obvious advantage to special education personnel when their qualifications for employment extend beyond one State. But is is also essential for children that a broad base of credentials be established because of the necessary movement of personnel from one State to another. In extremely "low-incidence" fields there may be only one preparation center for a large, multi State region. In such a case it is important that those who undertake preparation can be certified in several States.

One of the potential dangers in inter-State reciprocity arrangements is that a uniform and potentially rigid set of categories and qualifications for certifications might be engendered. Dortunately, there are creative leaders among State certification officers who are able to produce balanced orientation to flexibility and standards; but much work remains to be done. In the DELPHI survey respondents almost uniformly placed high value on further work in this area.

3.6 Examples

Positive: State certification officers agree on reciprocal certification of special education personnel who have met approved standards in "another" State.

Negative:

3.7 Guidelines

1	(1)	The certification process, while rigorous and demanding should be sufficiently flexible so as to encourage experimentation and innovation in developing new programs to prepare teachers in special education.
2	(2)	The certification process, while rigorous and demanding, should be sufficiently flexible as to encourage experimentation and innovation in roles and in preparation programs.
3	(3-A)	The certification process should encourage experimentation and innovation in developing new programs to prepare personnel in special education in response to the competencies needed to respond to total range of exceptional children.
4		

3.7 Rationale

One of the dangers in certification programs is that they can rigidify to the point of discouraging innovation in preparation programs and in service roles. A college, for example, might decide against its own best ideas because students in a new training program might be as high risk for refusal of certification. Similarly, local schools might hesitate excessively in trying new 'role' or formate for serving children because the problem of certifying personnel for new roles may be anticipated.

Fortunately, most State Certification officers and others recognize the potentially stultifying effects of a rigidly administered credentialing system and are prepared to work out arrangements for experimental programs.

3.7 Examples

Positive: A college which wishes to try a new preparation program for a new role is encouraged by the SEA and given assurance of cooperation for a 3 year period in certifying trainees in the new program.

Negative: An LEA which moves part of its 'special class' teachers to a resource teacher model is threatened by the SEA with non-compliance with certification requirements.

Section 4

4.0 PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

This brief section deals with the problems of continuing professional performance by personnel in the field of special education. The underlying assumption of most relevance here is that of the primary importance of the client; in other words, of the overriding importance of the quality of the education of exceptional children, even at the expense of the welfare of the individual special educator should he or she not continue to develop and to perform adequately in service to children. It is further assumed that persons who are well-prepared for entry roles in special education will not long remain prepared except as they undertake continuing programs for professional development.

In this section, in contrast with the preceding section on 'preparation', the major responsibility is assigned to the individual staff member. This is to say that in the case of the practicing special educator major responsibility and accountability rest with the individual person for his professional development and performance. Each individual must plan for his own development and accept the major responsibility for the quality of his work with children.

It is not assumed, however, that the system can operate totally in trust of the individual. Accordingly it is suggested in further guidelines of this section that every special educator has a responsibility to participate in the objective evaluation of his colleagues and of the programs of which he has knowledge. Only through the adequate implementation of such an evaluation system can the public be assured of protection and service in accordance with standards espoused by the professions, the schools and other agencies.

A concluding portion of this section then deals with the supports and assistance needed by special educators from their employing agencies if they are to meet high standards in a continuing way in their work. In effect, the message here is that if teachers and other personnel are to perform ethically and with good skill and insight throughout their careers they will need the support of well-designed continuing education systems and of decision/review systems which protect their integrity.

4.1 Guideline

Responsibility and accountability for continuing professional development and performance rest mainly with the individual staff member.

4.1 Rationale

Responsibility and accountability for the continuing development and performance of special educators is, of course, broadly shared by individuals and many agencies. But nothing really works except as the individual takes responsibility for continuing study of his own performance and developing his own knowledge and practice in his field. This guideline suggests the paramount importance of such individual responsibility for self-initiated development and performance. It also suggests that failure to develop and to perform should result in the disqualification of the individual for his role.

4.1 Examples

Positive: A teacher regularly participates in workshops, institutes and conventions which offer intensive training sessions.

The college instructor supports development of a system for viewing the performance of individual faculty members.

A carefully developed system for recording efforts of individuals to upgrade their preparation and performance is installed in a local school system.

Negative: A staff member fails to use revised and updated diagnostic materials in work with children and relies instead on earlier and less well developed versions of the same materials as "learned in college."

An obviously incompetent instructor is allowed to continue in her/his role in spite of the disservice and waste involved for all students.

4.2 Guideline

Special education staff members have a responsiblility to participate in the objective and systematic evaluation of colleagues, services and programs.

4.2 Rationale

No one has quite so close a view of the work of a special educator (teacher aide, teacher, professor, administrator) as those with whom he works day by day. Accordingly, there is more potentiality for the effective evaluation of individual development and performance by one's close colleagues than by any other single approach. This guideline suggests that it is a high responsibility of special educators to use their knowledge of close colleagues in evaluation activities as one means of improving service to children.

This is a difficult undertaking. Occasionally one encounters a teacher, for example, whose performance amounts to cruelty upon children who have unusual needs. This guideline calls upon all special educatorss who know of such situations to participate in evaluation activities which first priority of concern to the welfare of children, even at the expense of great personal regrets.

4.2 Examples

Positive: A consulting special educator "blows the whistle" in official channels on a teacher who apparently neglects the needs of a specific child in his/her class.

A professor reviews his colleagues' at "annual review time" with absolute candor and objectivity.

An administrator shares with each employee the results of evaluation of his work.

Negative: An obviously incompetent teacher goes unevaluated and continues his disservice to children.

A special educator adopts and applies a strange new system for educating exceptional children, without any procedure for evaluation of the system by colleagues.

4.3 Guideline

Institutions employing special education personnel should make provisions for and support of the inservice education of all staff.

4.3 Rationale

This guideline suggests that individual efforts for self-improvement need to be undergirded by strong institutional programs to offer inservice and continuing education. Ideally the opportunities for professional development activities are broad and numerous enough that the individual staff member has options concerning the pattern of activities he/she will undertake. In a sense the institution earns its right to hold high standards for individuals by demonstrating its concerns through provision of high quality programs for development of staff.

4.3 Examples

Positive: The school/college provides and encourages use of a sabbatical leave system by which staff members may undertake significant, full-immersion renewal studies for at least one year in seven.

The LEA plans an after-school optional study program "for credit" for all special education personnel.

Negative: The sabbatical leave plan is funded at only low-priority, marginal level.

4.4 Guideline

Institutions should not expect special educators to undertake activities which they consider unethical or harmful to children and should support them in formal due process proceedings when serious desagreements develop.

4.4 Rationale

But this procedure for cooperative planning also has potentialities for uncovering serious disagreements and even the possibility that one party may insist on a program which others consider totally beyond justification. This guideline suggests that teachers, while being encouraged to plan in cooperative ways with others, should not be expected to undertake programs which they feel are unethical or which seem extremely unlikely to be productive or helpful for a child. In the ultimate test case, the school should be prepared to underwrite support for the staff member who finds it necessary to contest a plan in a formal "due process" hearing or court situation.

4.4 Examples

Positive: "Due process" hearings are made equally available to parents, teachers or other parties in case of significant disagreement about a child's program.

Services of counsel are provided by the school district for a teacher whose performance has been challenged by the parents of one of his/her students.

Negative: A teacher is directed to "teach reading" to a child - without recourse - even though she feels it is a cruelty to further pursue this line of study at this time with a particular child.

4.5 Guideline

Institutions employing special education personnel should provide clear and permanent mechanics by which the staff may file and have heard their grievances about programs, personnel policies or other matters. "Due process" should be assured in all such proceedings.

4.5 Rationale

A source of potential difficulty when individual special educators take seriously their professional responsibilities is that they shall sometimes have gravely negative feelings about the programs in which they have a part and wish to have recourse to a mechanism for extraordinary test of the system. Sometimes the test may need to come on personnel problems, including their own situations, but also may refer to any aspect of the program. Presumably, a regular system of evaluation and correction will take care of most problems; what is in view here is the larger problem which needs to be dealt with formally and which entails an appeals procedure which, extends to "outside" figures for attention and adjudication. The guideline suggests that special educators who are expected to behave professionally with all due forthrightness and candor need to be supported by a regularized grievance procedure, with rights of due process and appeal.

4.5 Examples

Positive: Each department and higher echelon in the school (or hospital, college, etc.) has a grievance committee which is responsible for "hearing" grievances from any member or client of the system; appeal procedures to higher levels and to the courts are regularized.

Negative: "Complaints" by students in a course are dealt with summarily by the instructor, with no affect.

Glossary of Terms

AGENCY - An administrative division.

ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS - To determine the importance, size or value of the needs of the person or organization involved.

BOARD, LOCAL - A group of individuals from the same general geographic area working together for a particular purpose.

CENTERS - A place in or around which an activity concentrates or from which something originates.

CENTERS, PRACTICUM - As above, an area where opportunity is provided for a practical first hand experience.

CENTERS, PREPARATION - All agencies which conduct preparation activities - including colleges & universities, professional organizations, state departments of education, local education agencies and others.

CENTERS, TRAINING - As above, synonomous with preparation centers.

CERTIFICATION - The fulfillment of the requirements necessary to practice in a specific field. A state's legal authority to grant.

CHILDREN - All those persons below the legal age of responsibility. Generally refers to school age persons in this context.

CHILDREN, EXCEPTIONAL - Inclusive term for children who deviate considerably from the average in physique, sensory acuity, intelligence, social conformity, emotional development, etc.

COMPETENCIES - The qualification or capability to perform specialized tasks.

CONSULTANT - One who gives professional advice or services.

CONSUMER - One that utilizes goods or services provided by another.

DOUBLE MAJOR - A combination of two major areas of concentration.

EDUCATION - The knowledge and development resulting from an educational process.

EDUCATION, ELEMENTARY - That segment of education pertaining to the early years; generally kindergarten through sixth.

EDUCATION, SPECIAL - The education of pupils who deviate so far, physically and mentally, from the comparatively homogeneous groups of normal pupils that the standard curriculum is not adaptable to their educational needs.

EDUCATOR, TEACHER - A professional educator involved in the preparation of teachers.

EVALUATION - Examining and fixing the value of.

EXCEPTIONAL - See exceptional children.

EXPERTISE - Expert opinion or commentary in a particular field.

INSTITUTIONS - See preparation centers

INSTRUCTION - The action, practice, or profession of teaching.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT - See assessment of needs.

OUTCOMES - Results, effects or final consequences.

PARA-EDUCATIONAL - Term sometimes used to replace para-professional.

PARA-PROFESSIONAL - Refers to those pre-baccalaureate aides who assist the teacher in the classroom on a regular basis. Sometimes involved in instruction under teacher supervision.

PERFORMANCE - To demonstrate behavior.

PRACTICUM - A specified segment of a teacher education program where emphasis is placed on real-life experience in a classroom or lab.

PREPARATION - Refers to full range of preparation activities including pre-service, in-service, and continuing education.

PROCESS - A change or a changing in an object or organism in which a consistent quality or direction can be discerned.

PROFESSOR, CLINICAL - An instructor who is skilled in working with both children and teachers (pre-service and in-service) and can communicate easily at both levels.

PRACTICE - The process of repetition with variation until an acceptable level performance is reached.

PUPIL PERSONNEL WORKERS - Those persons who provide services and facilities in elementary and secondary schools whose aim is to adapt the school program to the needs of the learner and to adjust the learner to the school program.

ROLES, CHANGING - Role - the function played by an individual in a group, the individuals characteristic kind of contribution to a group.

SUPERVISOR - A person with the major responsibility for the behavior of those persons assigned to him.

TEACHING, STUDENT - That aspect of a teacher education program where emphasis is placed on actual experience with learners.

TRAINEE - One who is being trained or educated.

TRAINOR - One who is responsible for training or educating.

UPDATING - The process whereby a professional uses the latest knowledge to improve his own skills and techniques.

VALIDITY - Founded on truth, fact or law.

CLINICAL INSTRUCTOR - Generally refers to a person who is equally at home in working directly with teachers or children.

FIELD EXPERIENCE - That segment of a program where emphasis is placed on practical first hand experience in a real life experience.

LAB EXPERIENCE - Generally synonomous with field experience although sometimes tends to be more limited in time.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION - Refers to both preparation and employment situations; for example, the recruitment of students in college situations and of teachers or administrators in school situations.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL - Unless otherwise specified, reference is intended to all categories or classes of personnel including paraprofessionals, teachers, teacher educators, administrators, researchers and others.